DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 083 351 UD 013 872

TITLE	Hearing Before the Subcommittee on Equal Opportunities of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Ninety-Third Congress, First Session on H.R. 7807. Comprehensive Youth Opportunities Act of 1973. Hearing Held Washington, D.C., May 17, 1973.
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. House Committee on Education and Labor.
PUB DATE	17 May 73
NOTE	50p.; Committee Print, House Committee on Education and Labor
AVAILABLE FROM	Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 (No price quoted)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Disadvantaged Youth; Economically Disadvantaged; *Employment Opportunities; Federal Aid; *Federal Legislation; Manpower Development; *Recreational Programs; Summer Programs; *Youth Employment; Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS	Illinois; Maryland; Recreation Support Program; Summer Youth Transportation Program; Youth Corps

ABSTRACT

H.R. 7807 is a bill to provide financial assistance for the development and implementation of work and training and year-round recreational opportunities, together with related services and for other purposes, for disadvantaged young people. These hearings before the Subcommittee on Equal Opportunities of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, include the statements of: Carol Bickley, senior associate, Division of Special Programs, National Recreation and Park Association; Dr. James L. Jones, special assistant to the Mayor for Youth Opportunity Services, Washington, D.C.; Milton Morris, president, National Association of Neighborhood Youth Corps Directors; Hon. Dan Rostenkowski, a Representative in Congress from the State of Illinois; and, Hon. George Seibels, mayor, Birmingham, Alabama. The text of the hearings incorporates the prepared statements or letters of: Sam Bernstein, assistant to the mayor for manpower programs, Chicago, Illinois; James M. Chavis, director, Baltimore Neighborhood Youth Corps; and Lawrence S. Duda, project director, Schools' Neighborhood Youth Corps, Cleveland Public Schools, Cleveland, Ohio. [Parts of this document may not be clearly legible on microfiche due to size of print in the original.] (JM)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

COMPREHENSIVE YOUTH OPPORTUNITIES ACT OF 1973

ED 082251

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-THIRD CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

H.R. 7807

A BILL TO PROVIDE FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF WORK AND TRAINING AND YEAR-ROUND RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES, TOGETHER WITH RELATED SERVICES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

HEARING HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C., MAY 17, 1973

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor

CARL D. PERKINS, *Chairman*

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: UD RC

In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

UD 013 872

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
97-526 WASHINGTON : 1973

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky, *Chairman*

FRANK THOMPSON, JR., New Jersey
JOHN H. DENT, Pennsylvania
DOMINICK V. DANIELS, New Jersey
JOHN BRADEMAS, Indiana
JAMES G. O'HARA, Michigan
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California
WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii
LLOYD MEEDS, Washington
PHILLIP BURTON, California
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM "BILL" CLAY, Missouri
SHIRLEY CHISHOLM, New York
MARIO BIAGGI, New York
ELLA T. GRASSO, Connecticut
ROMANO L. MAZZOLI, Kentucky
HERMAN BADILLIO, New York
IKE ANDREWS, North Carolina
WILLIAM LEHMAN, Florida
JAIME BENITEZ, Puerto Rico

ALBERT H. QUIE, Minnesota
JOHN M. ASHBROOK, Ohio
ALPHONZO BELL, California
JOHN N. ERLENBORN, Illinois
JOHN DELLENBACK, Oregon
MARVIN L. ESCH, Michigan
EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM A. STEIGER, Wisconsin
EARL F. LANDGREBE, Indiana
ORVAL HANSEN, Idaho
EDWIN B. FORSYTHE, New Jersey
JACK F. KEMP, New York
PETER A. PEYSER, New York
DAVID TOWELL, Nevada
RONALD A. SARASIN, Connecticut
ROBERT J. HUBER, Michigan

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES

AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California, *Chairman*

SHIRLEY CHISHOLM, New York
PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii
WILLIAM "BILL" CLAY Missouri
JAIME BENITEZ, Puerto Rico

WILLIAM A. STEIGER, Wisconsin
ALPHONZO BELL, California
EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN, Pennsylvania

CONTENTS

	Page
Text of H.R. 7807	1
Statement of—	
Bickley, Carol, senior associate, Division of Special Programs, National Recreation and Park Association, accompanied by James Hadaway, executive director of Memphis, Tenn., Park Commission	26
Jones, Dr. James L., special assistant to the Mayor for Youth Opportunity Services, Washington, D.C.	32
Morris, Milton, president, National Association of Neighborhood Youth Corps Directors, accompanied by James Chavis, director, Baltimore, Md., Neighborhood Youth Corps	38
Rostenkowski, Hon. Dan, a Representative in Congress from the State of Illinois, accompanied by Sam Bernstein, assistant to the mayor for manpower programs, Chicago, Ill	19
Seibels, Hon. George, mayor, Birmingham, Ala	6
Prepared statements and letters:	
Bernstein, Sam, assistant to the mayor for manpower programs, Chicago, Ill., letter to Chairman Hawkins, dated May 18, 1973	26
Chavis, James M., director, Baltimore Neighborhood Youth Corps, testimony by	45
Duda, Lawrence S., project director, Schools' Neighborhood Youth Corps, Cleveland Public Schools, Cleveland, Ohio, letter to Chairman Hawkins, dated May 16, 1973	41
Jones, Dr. James L., Special Assistant to the Mayor for Youth Opportunity Services, Washington, D.C., statement of	32
Morris, Milton C., project director, Cleveland Neighborhood Youth Corps, Cleveland, Ohio:	
Cleveland Neighborhood Youth Corps Enrollee Advisory Board, statement of the	40
Prepared statement of	39
Rostenkowski, Hon. Dan, a Representative in Congress from the State of Illinois, testimony of	19
Seibels, Hon. George, mayor, Birmingham, Ala., statement on behalf of the National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors	6

COMPREHENSIVE YOUTH OPPORTUNITIES ACT OF 1973

THURSDAY, MAY 17, 1973

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES
OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met at 10 a.m., pursuant to call, in room 2257, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Augustus F. Hawkins (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Hawkins, Mink, and Chisholm.

[Text of H.R. 7807 follows:]

[H.R. 7807, 93d Cong. First Sess.]

A BILL To provide financial assistance for the development and implementation of work and training and year-round recreational opportunities, together with related services, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Comprehensive Youth Opportunities Act of 1973."

STATEMENT OF FINDING AND PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress finds and declares that—

(a) with the increase in the population of our Nation's youth has come an increase in the need for such basic services as employment, recreation, transportation, and cultural activities;

(b) the need for such basic services is greatest among those youth from families with low income;

(c) in the particular area of recreation, many young Americans are unable to have healthful, developmental recreational opportunities because of lack of personal financial resources and the absence of appropriate facilities to provide such opportunities; that the denial of these opportunities is more evident and critical with respect to the economically disadvantaged youth who reside in the crowded neighborhoods of the Nation's cities and distressed rural areas; and that the problem of providing such recreational opportunities is compounded by such factors as the financial inability of local governmental agencies to plan and operate comprehensive year-round recreation programs, the changing patterns of public school operations which are presenting greater challenges to local governmental recreation agencies, and the operation of State and Federal recreation programs in locations far removed from the Nation's cities and rural areas.

(d) the administration and delivery of youth services are essentially local matters, requiring a more comprehensive, unified, and flexible approach, and that units of general local government are in the best position to determine priorities in regard to the needs of their youth;

(e) although the need for youth services exists year round as an adjunct to basic education provided by local school systems; it is more urgent during the summer months.

TITLE I—YOUTH MANPOWER

PRIME SPONSORS

SEC. 101. (a) For the purposes of this Act, a prime sponsor may be—

(1) any unit of general local government which (A) has a population of seventy-five thousand or more persons on the basis of the most satisfactory current data available to the Secretary and (i) which is a city, or (ii) which is a county or other unit of general local government which is determined, in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary shall prescribe, to have general governmental powers substantially similar to those of a city; or (B) has a population of less than seventy-five thousand persons on the basis of the most satsifactory current data available to the Secretary but has the largest population of any unit of general local government meeting the requirements of clause (i) or (ii) of this paragraph in a State;

(2) any combination of units of general local government which covers a geographical area which has a population of seventy-five thousand or more persons on the basis of the most satisfactory current data available to the Secretary; or

(3) any combination of units of general local government, without regard to the population requirements of paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection, in rural areas designated by the State which have substantial outmigration and high unemployment; shall be eligible to be a prime sponsor of a comprehensive manpower services program in accordance with the provisions of this section.

(b) Any unit (or combination of units) of general local government which is eligible to be a prime sponsor under subsection (a) and which desires to be so designated in order to enter into arrangements with the Secretary under this title shall submit to the Secretary a prime sponsorship plan.

(c) When two or more units (or combination of units) of general local government each submit plans which include a common geographical area under their respective jurisdictions and which are consistent with the purposes of this title and meet the requirements set forth in subsection (a), the Secretary shall approve for that geographical area the unit of general local government plan which it determines will most effectively carry out the purposes of this title.

(d) Except as provided in subsection (c), the Secretary may approve any prime sponsorship plan submitted under this section if it is consistent with the provisions of this title. A plan submitted under this section may be disapproved or a prior designation or a prime sponsor may be withdrawn only if the Secretary has provided—

(1) written notice of intention to disapprove such plan, including a statement of the reasons thereof;

(2) for a reasonable time to submit corrective amendments to such plan; and

(3) an opportunity for a public hearing upon which basis an appeal to the Secretary may be taken as of right.

WORK AND TRAINING

SEC. 102. (a) It is the purpose of this section to authorize the Secretary to establish—

(1) an in-school program providing paid work experience, remedial education, counseling and other supportive services outside of school hours, to economically disadvantaged high school students who require financial assistance to either remain in or return to school;

(2) an out-of-school program providing a combination of work experience, education and skill training, along with supportive services such as counseling and health examination, to economically disadvantaged high school dropouts between the ages of sixteen and twenty-one, with the primary objective of returning the enrollee to school; and

(3) a program to provide useful work experience for economically disadvantaged youth during the summer months.

(b) Such programs shall be designed to—

(1) make a contribution to solving (either on a national basis or in areas where the problem is most acute) the persistent and perplexing problem of very high rates of unemployment among persons between the ages of sixteen and twenty-one;

(2) increase the availability of jobs by finding new work opportunities for young workers and by encouraging the development of part-time employment arrangements which make a contribution to improving the young workers employability;

(3) concentrate on efforts to assist those groups, subgroups, or segments within the age group sought to be assisted under this section which suffer the highest rate of unemployment.

ALLOCATION OF FUNDS

SEC. 103. (a) Of the sums available for any fiscal year for carrying out this title, not less than 85 per centum shall be allocated among the units of general local government, in accordance with the latest available data, so that equal proportions are distributed on the basis of—

(1) the relative number of youth, sixteen through twenty-one years of age, in each unit of general local government, as compared to all units of general local government, and

(2) the relative number of youth, sixteen through twenty-one years of age, living with families with incomes below the poverty line and low-income youths otherwise capable of participation who reside in public or private institutions, in each unit of general local government.

(b) Of the sums made available to units of general local government, 10 per centum shall be available to enable such units of general local government to make grants for the purposes of carrying out their planning role.

(c) The Secretary is authorized to make such reallocation of the unobligated amounts of any appropriations for carrying out this title.

(d) As soon as practicable after funds are appropriated to carry out this Act for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register the Allotment required by subsection (a).

AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 104. (a) For the purposes of carrying out section 102(a) (1) and (2) of this title, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for each succeeding fiscal year, $250,000,000.

(b) For the purposes of carrying out section 102(a)(3) of this title, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for each succeeding fiscal year, $450,000,000.

TITLE II—RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES

SEC. 201. The Secretary is authorized, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, to develop and implement programs for youth, ages eight through fifteen years of age, which are used or usable for recreation and supportive services including but not limited to—

(1) transfer of funds to any Federal department or agency engaged in the administration of recreation programs and supportive services;

(2) technical assistance, to be provided directly by the Secretary representatives working with manpower planning staffs under the Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System as approved by the Secretary; and

(3) coordination of all recreation and related youth services programs by the Secretary with units of general local government.

ALLOCATION OF FUNDS

SEC. 202. (a) Of the funds made available for the purposes of this title, an amount equal to 10 per centum of each unit of general local government's allocation shall be available to enable said units of general local government to assess and plan the implementation of recreational services for economically disadvantaged youth.

(b) Of the funds made available for grants to carry out programs under this title, not less than 75 per centum shall be allotted among the units of general local government, in accordance with the latest available data, so that equal proportions are distributed on the basis of—

(1) the relative number of youth, eight through fifteen years of age, in each unit of general local government, as compared to all units of general local government;

(2) the relative number of related youth eight through fifteen years of age, living with families with incomes below the poverty line, and low-income youths otherwise capable of participation who reside in public or private institutions, in each unit of general local government.

(c) The Secretary is authorized to reserve not more than 10 per centum of the funds made available under this title, to make grants to any public or private bodies or agencies, in coordination with chief elected officials of units of general local government, subject to such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, for the purposes of providing recreational opportunities to concentrations of economically disadvantaged youth if he determines the needs of such youth are not adequately met through other programs established pursuant to this Act.

PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 203. (a) Particular attention shall be given to the needs of Appalachia and Indian tribes.

(b) To the maximum extent feasible, recreation sites selected for programs must be located directly in low-income communities or areas to insure that economically disadvantaged youth will benefit from the program.

(c) Programs assisted under this Act shall, to the extent feasible, be designed to include the following:

(1) Admission to special events,
(2) Athletic activities,
(3) Cultural field trips,
(4) Informational tours,
(5) Instruction in arts and crafts,
(6) Lunches provided as part of the recreational activities, and
(7) Special recreation clothing where needed.

(d) Funds made available to units of general local government may be made available by the chief elected official of such unit, or his designated agent, to any political subdivisions within that unit of general local government.

COORDINATION WITH OTHER FEDERAL PROGRAMS

SEC. 204. (a) The Secretary shall take appropriate action to insure that any program for which financial assistance is received under this title utilizes, to the maximum extent practicable, lands and facilities in public ownership that may be utilized to carry out the purposes of this title.

(b) Funds made available to other Federal agencies for programs supporting this title shall not affect grants for funds made available under this title.

(c) The Secretary may reimburse the Secretary of the Interior for expenses incurred in assisting in the implementation of this title.

AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 205. There are authorized such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for the two succeeding fiscal years ending with June 30, 1976.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. (a) Whenever the Secretary determines that any prime sponsor designated to serve under this Act is—

(1) maintaining a pattern or practice of discrimination in application of section 103(a)(1) of this Act or otherwise failing to serve equitably various segments of economically disadvantaged youth;

(2) incurring unreasonable administrative cost in the conduct of activities and programs as determined pursuant to regulations;

(3) failing to give due consideration to continued funding of programs of demonstrated effectiveness, including those previously conducted under title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964;

(4) otherwise failing to carry out the purposes of this Act; the Secretary shall revoke the prime sponsor's designation and shall not make any further payments to such prime sponsor under this Act, and he shall notify such sponsor to return to him all unexpended sums paid under this Act during that fiscal year.

(b) The Secretary shall, prior to making any payments to a prime sponsor under this Act for any fiscal year, enter into an agreement with such sponsor which contains provisions adequate to assure that the provisions of this section are carried out effectively.

REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 302. (a) Each unit of general local government or private nonprofit agency receiving financial assistance under this Act shall keep such records and make such reports as the Secretary shall prescribe, including records which fully disclose the disposition of the proceeds of such assistance, the total cost of the undertakings in connection with which such assistance is given or used, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

(b) The Secretary shall submit an annual report to the Congress on the progress made toward implementing the purposes of this Act.

EVALUATION

SEC. 303. The Secretary shall provide for a system of continuing evaluation of all programs and activities conducted pursuant to this Act, including their cost in relation to their effectiveness in achieving stated goals, their impact on communities and participants, their implication for related programs, the extent to which they meet the needs of persons of various ages, and the adequacy of their mechanism for the delivery of services. He shall also arrange for obtaining the opinions of participants about the strengths and weaknesses of the programs.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 304. As used in this Act, the term—

(a) "Unit" of general local government includes the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands;

(b) "Secretary" means the Secretary of Labor; except where specific reference to the Secretary of the Interior appears in title II;

(c) "City" means an incorporated municipality having general governmental powers.

Mr. HAWKINS. The committee will come to order.

This morning the Subcommittee on Equal Opportunities will study the need for continued Federal support for manpower and recreation opportunities for disadvantaged young people in our cities and depressed rural areas.

The necessity for job-training and employment opportunities for disadvantaged youth in our cities is particularly critical in the summer months, but it is great all year long. Many of these young people depend on part-time or summer jobs to continue their education; their families depend on assistance to supplement already meager incomes. Unemployment among young people between 16 and 19 as of April this year was 15.4 percent up from 14.2 percent in March. Unemployment among minority youth was even more severe: the average unemployment rate for nonwhite youth in 1972 was 33.5 percent.

In the past, the need for summer employment for disadvantaged youth has been met in large part by the Federal Neighborhood Youth Corps summer program. This year, the administration has determined, that no funds should be allocated for the summer program and that instead, local governments could provide jobs for youths out of emergency employment funds, forcing cities to choose between father and son for job placement.

Support for recreational programs for disadvantaged youth has also been endangered. The administration has recently announced that $14 million will be available for the recreational support program for this summer, $1 million less than was allocated last summer. Further,

guidelines for the RSP were sent out on May 1 with a May 9 deadline, hardly an adequate time to allow cities to plan and submit their proposals.

The legislation which Congressman Rostenkowski and I have introduced, H.R. 7807, the Comprehensive Youth Opportunities Act of 1973, would provide year-round support for recreation and manpower programs for disadvantaged young people. It is essential that these vital programs be given the support and resources necessary to effectively serve the needs of our young people.

We are certainly honored and pleased to have as the first witness Mr. George Seibels, mayor of Birmingham, Ala. Mr. Seibels, we are delighted to have you. Would you be seated and present your views at this point.

I see you do have a statement which will be entered in the record in its entirety including the material which is attached thereto. You may proceed at this time to either read from your statement, to condense it, or to proceed as you so desire.

STATEMENT OF HON. GEORGE SEIBELS, MAYOR, BIRMINGHAM, ALA.

Mr. SEIBELS. Thank you very much, Congressman Hawkins and Congresswoman Chisholm. I am delighted to be here. This is one of my favorite subjects, the young people, employment and recreation.

I have a lot to say but your time is limited and I have prepared some remarks of my own which I will give you a copy of and also these. There are two of them and I will take excerpts from both of them.

Mr. HAWKINS. The documents will be entered in the record at this point.

[The documents referred to follow:]

STATEMENT OF HON. GEORGE SEIBELS, MAYOR OF BIRMINGHAM, ALA.

Mr. Chairman, members of the Subcommittee: I am George Seibels, Mayor of Birmingham, Alabama. I am here today to testify on behalf of the National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors on H.R. 7807, the Comprehensive Youth Services Act of 1973.

Over the past decade—more often to ease or forestall urban unrest rather than meet carefully defined needs—the federal government has developed a variety of summer youth programs. Inadequate in scope and substance, uncoordinated and predictably late, these programs nevertheless are and have been a significant social service initiative and have come to be relied on by hard-pressed local governments and their constituents.

In the past, these programs have more often stressed quantity than quality, providing busy- and make-work projects rather than a means to maximize the resources' impact on youth. Increasing the resources devoted to solving youth problems and developing a thorough and intelligent strategy for utilizing these resources is indeed a step in the right direction.

One of the more serious, and eminently preventable problems, we have encountered in administering this program has been the annual funding battle. Each year federal funding of the summer youth programs is uncertain and it has been mid-July on more than one occasion before the cities have been notified of their total dollar allocation. This year, the problem has intensified and the confusion is worse than ever. As you know, the Administration had indicated its willingness to make only Emergency Employment Act money available for funding summer youth employment programs—an alternative that forces cities to choose between retaining a head of household in the public service employment

program or providing a job opportunity for a young person during the summer months. Many cities have made the difficult choice and will have *no* summer youth employment program this year. A legislative proposal that would solve, once and for all, the problems the cities face each year, seems to us the most viable course of action. It is time that we were able to plan in advance with certainty of federal funding available, reallocate our scarce local resource to provide a meaningful employment opportunity to our young citizens.

Both the National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors have developed and adopted policy which calls for a comprehensive approach to resolving the employment and recreation needs of the urban young. Our policy recommends that the federal government take the initiative in linking and coordinating the various federal, state, local and private resources available for youth programs; it emphasizes that comprehensive youth services are needed not just in the summer months but on a year-round basis and it urges that federal financial support for youth programs be offered in a manner more conducive to efficient and effective program development and planning in accordance with locally-determined priorities and needs. Further, our policy calls for adequate funding with sufficient lead time to insure the success of these vital programs. We have indicated to the Congress on numerous occasions that a comprehensive approach to addressing the problems of our youth would be far more prudent, productive and effective than the current haphazard, piecemeal and last minute arrangements which have tequently wreaked havoc on carefully developed local plans. We are encouraged ro note that some effort in this direction is now moving through the Congress.

Essential to the development of our young people are a range of programs—education, employment and leisure time activities—which will enable them to mature as well-rounded individuals with an equal opportunity to compete in the working world and be capable of enjoying the richness of life which America affords. While a good education is the single most important element in assuring an individual's future equal opportunities, the role of jobs should not be minimized. Employment provides young people more than pocket money. After-school and summer jobs afford young men and women:

Vocational exposure on which they may rationally base their future career choices;

the opportunity to relate closely with mature, stable adults;

the chance to develop work habits and skills which will enhance their future employability;

for some, sadly enough, income which puts food in their mouths, shoes on their feet and the possibility of remaining in or returning to school.

Some of the money provided by the federal government in the past for summer youth programs has been used to provide desparately needed recreation programs in the inner city. This money has provided more than mere "fun and games:" it provided scores of thousands of culturally deprived youngsters their first look at plantariums, art museums, zoos, symphony orchestras and other cultural attractions in their cities. Thousands more were able to compete in athletics or receive instruction in the theater and performing arts. The unbounded energy of our young was thus channeled constructively and provided a physically healthful outlet as well.

Many cities have run the Department of Agriculture's special summer food service program in conjunction with their recreation programs and as a consequence, many of our disadvantaged youngsters were provided at least one nutritious meal each day. Not only were some young people fed in these facilities, but many cities employed older disadvantaged youth in helping serve the lunches. And it is precisely in those cities, with high concentrations of economically disadvantaged youth, that limited local resources preclude the municipality from providing these programs unless they receive federal assistance.

To underscore the need in our urban centers, I would like to submit for the record the survey conducted by the League of Cities and Conference of Mayors on the cities projected youth employment, recreation and transportation needs for this coming summer. The cities surveyed were asked how many youth they could effectively supervise and provide with worthwhile work. Thus, these figures are not a statement of total need—that figure is far higher—but a careful, conservative estimate of the cities' ability to provide summer youth employment in 1973.

1973 NLC AND USCM SUMMER YOUTH SURVEY

SUMMER NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS

City (rank and size)	Population	Slots				Dollars [2]
		1972 need	1972 actual [1]		1973 need	1973 need
Region I: Boston (16)	641,000	5,000	5,213	(4,692)	6,400	2,995,200
Region II:						
Buffalo (28)	463,000	4,268	2,238	(2,014)	6,834	3,198,312
Newark (35)	382,000	14,563	7,000	(6,300)	14,563	6,815,484
New York (1)	7,868,000	77,500	54,800	(49,320)	77,500	36,270,000
Rochester (49)	296,000	4,650	1,030	(927)	4,650	2,176,100
Region III:						
Baltimore (7)	906,000	9,420	7,712	(6,941)	9,420	4,408,560
Norfolk (47)	308,000	2,625	2,200	(1,980)	3,500	1,638,000
Philadelphia (4)	1,949,000	12,500	8,571	(7,714)	15,000	7,020,000
Pittsburgh (24)	520,000	9,265	5,670	(5,103)	9,265	4,336,000
District of Columbia (9)	757,000	36,000	3,999	(3,599)	20,000	9,360,000
Region IV:						
Atlanta (27)	497,000	3,408	4,680	(4,212)	5,388	2,521,584
Birmingham (48)	301,000	2,135	2,757	(2,481)	2,774	1,298,232
Jacksonville (23)	529,000	1,736	637	(573)	2,500	1,170,000
Louisville (38)	361,000	3,500	2,250	(2,025)	3,500	1,638,000
Memphis (17)	624,000	2,394	1,935	(1,741)	2,394	1,120,392
Miami (Dade County) (42)	335,000	8,226	5,429	(4,886)	8,226	3,849,763
Nashville (30)	448,000	2,000	1,700	(1,530)	2,000	936,000
Tampa (50)	278,000	6,515	2,649	(2,384)	6,515	3,049,020
Region V:						
Chicago (2)	3,376,000	40,000	31,617	(28,455)	40,000	18,720,000
Cincinnati (29)	452,000	3,000	3,592	(3,233)	5,000	2,340,000
Cleveland (10)	751,000	11,100	12,457	(11,211)	12,500	5,850,000
Columbus (21)	540,000	2,000	1,650	(1,485)	1,800	842,400
Detroit (5)	1,511,000	25,000	18,488	(16,639)	25,000	11,700,000
Indianapolis (11)	745,000	2,500	2,100	(1,890)	3,000	1,404,000
Milwaukee (12)	717,000	3,000	3,379	(3,041)	3,379	1,581,372
Minneapolis (32)	434,000	2,735	1,800	(1,620)	3,080	1,441,440
St. Paul (46)	310,000	1,025	1,810	(1,008)	1,300	608,400
Toledo (34)	384,000	990	1,400	(1,260)	1,400	655,200
Region VI:						
Dallas (8)	944,000	2,280	1,505	(1,355)	2,280	1,067,040
El Paso (45)	322,000	3,000	1,168	(1,051)	4,672	2,186,496
Fort Worth (33)	393,000	1,507	155	(140)	1,507	705,276
Houston (6)	1,233,000	3,560	5,284	(4,756)	5,664	2,650,752
New Orleans (19)	593,000	5,000	3,085	(2,776)	5,000	2,340,000
Oklahoma City (37)	366,000	1,530	1,010	(909)	1,530	716,040
San Antonio (15)	654,000	5,514	5,080	(4,572)	6,000	2,808,000
Tulsa (43)	332,000	1,011	771	(693)	1,011	473,148
Region VII:						
Kansas City (26)	507,000	4,000	3,580	(3,222)	4,000	1,872,000
Omaha (41)	347,000	1,670	867	(780)	1,670	786,560
St. Louis (18)	622,000	5,910	8,060	(7,254)	9,000	4,212,000
Region VIII: Denver (25)	515,000	2,100	2,038	(1,834)	2,100	982,800
Region IX:						
Honolulu (44)	325,000	2,800	791	(711)	2,800	1,310,400
Long Beach (40)	358,000	432	384	(345)	432	202,176
Los Angeles (3)	2,813,000	24,568	25,319	(22,787)	27,491	11,700,000
Oakland (39)	362,000	5,850	2,050	(1,845)	5,850	2,737,800
Phoenix (20)	582,000	17,000	3,964	(3,567)	17,000	7,956,000
San Diego (14)	697,000	4,510	4,733	(4,259)	5,500	2,574,000
San Francisco (13)	716,000	8,000	4,000	(3,600)	8,000	3,744,000
San Jose (31)	446,000	3,535	1,910	(1,719)	3,535	1,654,380
Region X:						
Portland (36)	382,000	5,000	2,500	(2,250)	5,000	2,340,000
Seattle (22)	581,000	5,000	2,163	(1,947)	5,000	2,340,000
SAMPLING OF CITIES OTHER THAN 50 LARGEST						
Akron, Ohio	275,425	1,216	1,190	(1,071)	1,351	632,268
Albany, N.Y	114,873	540	449	(404)	600	280,800
Albuquerque, N. Mex	243,751	1,000	815	(733)	1,000	468,000
Amarillo, Tex	127,010	1,092	820	(738)	1,200	561,600
Baton Rouge, La	165,963	225	150	(135)	250	117,000
Columbia, S.C	113,542	1,825	2,030	(1,827)	2,030	950,040
Columbus, Ga	154,168	1,820	1,720	(1,548)	2,000	936,000
Dayton, Ohio	243,601	1,500	1,320	(1,188)	2,500	1,170,000
Des Moines, Iowa	200,587	750	750	(675)	750	351,000
Erie, Pa	129,231	950	950	(855)	950	444,600
Flint, Mich	193,317	1,800	920	(828)	2,000	936,000
Fort Lauderdale, Fla	139,590	540	600	(540)	600	280,800
Gary, Ind	175,415	4,447	3,500	(3,150)	4,447	2,031,196
Greensboro, N.C	144,076	871	880	(792)	968	453,028
Hartford, Conn	158,017	2,730	2,495	(2,245)	3,000	1,404,000

SAMPLING OF CITIES OTHER THAN 50 LARGEST—Continued

City (rank and size)	Population	Slots 1972 need	Slots 1972 actual [1]		Slots 1973 need	Dollars [2] 1973 need
Jackson, Miss	153,968	757	403	(353)	757	354,276
Knoxville, Tenn	174,587	1,520	1,520	(1,368)	1,529	711,360
Lansing, Mich	131,546	900	460	(414)	1,000	468,000
Lincoln, Nebr	149,518	350	386	(347)	400	187,200
Little Rock, Ark	132,483	1,320	72	(65)	1,320	617,760
Mobile, Ala	190,026	900	756	(680)	950	444,600
Montgomery, Ala	133,386	500	557	(501)	570	266,760
Riverside, Calif	140,089	150	75	(67)	150	70,200
Santa Ana, Calif	156,601	2,550	1,900	(1,710)	2,800	1,310,400
Savannah, Ga	118,349	600	550	(450)	650	304,200
Shreveport, La	182,064	637	628	(565)	700	327,600
Syracuse, N.Y	197,208	1,365	1,200	(1,080)	1,500	702,000
Tacoma, Wash	154,581	600	588	(525)	600	280,800
Wichita, Kans	276,554	980	1,070	(967)	1,075	503,100
Winston-Salem, N.C	132,913	850	750	(675)	850	397,800
Worcester, Mass	176,572	825	705	(634)	900	421,200
50 largest total	410,831	278,490	(250,641)	421,930	197,463,240	
Balance of cities	537,893	461,732	(415,559)	597,061	279,424,548	
Total	948,724	740,222	(666,200)	1,018,991	476,887,788	

[1] All figures in the above chart represent 10-week slots except the 1st column under 1972 actual which are 9-week slots.
[2] Dollar figures represent 10-week, 26-hour slots at $1.65 per hour.

SUMMER RECREATION SUPPORT PROGRAM (RSP)

	1972 need	1972 actual	1973 need
Region I: Boston	$180,000	$168,000	$350,000
Region II:			
Buffalo	120,000	123,000	125,000
Newark	140,000	100,000	200,000
New York	2,934,000	2,336,000	2,934,000
Rochester	95,000	68,000	136,000
Region III:			
Baltimore	335,000	302,910	335,000
Norfolk	180,000	132,000	201,500
Philadelphia	700,000	543,000	1,000,000
Pittsburgh	165,000	168,000	203,000
District of Columbia	364,000	245,000	364,000
Region IV:			
Atlanta	180,000	143,000	180,000
Birmingham	170,000	120,000	170,000
Jacksonville	175,000	150,000	250,000
Louisville	130,000	96,000	130,000
Memphis	305,000	264,000	305,000
Miami (Dade County)	192,000	126,000	192,000
Nashville	150,000	150,000	200,000
Tampa	175,000	132,000	175,000
Region V:			
Chicago	2,100,000	913,000	2,100,000
Cincinnati	175,000	135,000	175,000
Cleveland	205,000	230,000	380,000
Columbus	211,000	132,000	211,000
Detroit	897,000	399,000	897,000
Indianapolis	195,000	130,000	260,000
Milwaukee	155,000	144,000	160,000
Minneapolis	96,000	63,000	130,000
St. Paul	58,000	36,000	53,000
Toledo	120,000	84,000	120,000
Region VI:			
Dallas	285,000	228,000	285,000
El Paso	200,000	194,000	250,000
Fort Worth	173,000	108,000	175,000
Houston	440,000	350,000	440,000
New Orleans	500,000	306,000	500,000
San Antonio	400,000	324,000	500,000
Tulsa	115,000	92,000	200,000
Oklahoma City	170,000	108,000	170,000
Region VII:			
Kansas City	130,000	118,000	200,000
Omaha	96,000	61,000	96,000
St. Louis	384,000	254,000	405,000
Region VIII: Denver	170,000	126,400	170,000

SUMMER RECREATION SUPPORT PROGRAM (RSP)—Continued

	1972 need	1972 actual	1973 need
Region IX:			
Honolulu	99,000	70,000	140,000
Long Beach	125,000	72,000	125,000
Los Angeles	650,000	552,000	650,000
Oakland	125,000	104,000	125,000
Phoenix	200,000	144,000	238,000
San Diego	200,000	164,000	825,000
San Francisco	250,000	180,000	250,000
San Jose	100,000	85,000	100,000
egion X:			
Portland	135,000	89,000	135,000
Seattle	129,000	89,000	129,000
50 largest total	15,928,000	11,451,310	18,096,500
Balance of cities	6,030,000	3,548,690	6,850,080
Total	21,958,000	15,000,000	24,946,680

SUMMER YOUTH TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM (SYTP)

Region I: Boston	$20,000	$10,700	$20,000
Region II:			
Buffalo	13,000	7,500	13,000
Newark	39,500	23,437	69,300
New York	251,400	149,130	500,000
Rochester	12,000	7,500	15,000
Region III:			
Baltimore	35,000	21,100	35,000
Norfolk	12,000	7,500	25,600
Philadelphia	24,360	24,360	100,000
Pittsburgh	22,000	12,650	22,000
Washington, D.C.	38,700	22,960	100,000
Region IV:			
Atlanta	30,000	12,080	30,000
Birmingham	24,000	13,790	24,000
Jacksonville	14,000	6,300	14,000
Louisville	12,500	7,500	12,500
Memphis	18,000	11,860	18,000
Miami (Dade County)	23,000	12,000	23,000
Nashville	12,000	7,000	12,000
Tampa	17,000	7,500	0
Region V:			
Chicago	70,000	42,240	70,000
Cincinnati	15,000	7,920	15,000
Cleveland	35,000	19,310	35,000
Columbia	17,000	8,640	17,000
Detroit	75,000	36,560	75,500
Indianapolis	15,000	8,480	15,000
Milwaukee	65,000	47,280	66,192
Minneapolis	20,000	12,380	75,000
St. Paul	12,500	7,500	12,500
Toledo	15,750	7,990	20,000
Region VI:			
Dallas	23,990	19,340	23,990
El Paso	58,900	38,900	77,800
Forth Worth	15,000	8,130	15,000
Houston	45,000	25,060	0
New Orleans	25,000	14,790	25,000
Oklahoma City	25,000	14,000	25,000
San Antonio	26,570	14,570	26,570
Tulsa	12,500	7,500	20,000
Region VII:			
Kansas City	50,000	13,970	50,000
Omaha	15,000	13,500	16,000
St. Louis	43,500	25,790	43,500
Region VIII: Denver	29,000	18,320	29,000
Region IX:			
Honolulu	15,000	7,500	15,000
Long Beach	16,000	7,500	16,000
Los Angeles	82,870	62,870	164,000
Oakland	28,000	15,000	28,000
Phoenix	23,000	11,740	25,000
San Diego	30,000	14,360	30,000
San Francisco	25,000	11,970	25,000
San Jose	8,160	7,500	9,000
Region X:			
Portland	13,000	25,000	25,000
Seattle	32,100	19,060	32,100
50 largest total	1,608,940	979,487	2,155,552
Balance of cities	1,141,060	520,513	1,527,879
Total	2,750,000	1,500,000	3,683,431

Mr. SEIBELS. I am speaking here in behalf of the Comprehensive Youth Opportunities Act of 1973. I would like to give you a little of my background. The U.S. Youth Games is going to be in my city. New York, Boston, Fort Worth, New Orleans, Washington, 12 cities from across the country will bring into Birmingham 62—this is recreation now, and we feel we have some splendid recreation for our young people, and this is part of this Comprehensive Youth Service Act of 1973.

But anyway, they come to Birmingham, they are there 4 days and they will be there in August. This all ties in with what I am going to say. I have also in our city 35 vest-pocket playgrounds. This was all done with city money. In other words, I am saying that we put our money where our mouth is.

We are raising $50,000 from private funds to bring the U.S. Games to Birmingham.

Mr. HAWKINS. May I ask, what is the date of those games?

Mr. SEIBELS. The 16th, 17th, 18th, and 19th of August.

I have been mayor going on 6 years. I worked very closely with the Mayor's Council of Youth Opportunity. Then that went over to the Labor Department, as you know, and we have had, I think, good success in my city of employment and recreation of the youth.

I won't go into detail other than to say that we put great emphasis on it and the city puts up money itself along with what we are able to get from the Congress.

With that in mind, I will start my remarks and say the city of Birmingham has a population of better than 300,000, 80,000 of which are between ages 8 and 21. And 14,000 of these young people are from families with incomes that fall below the poverty level. For the past 6 years, the city of Birmingham has operated a variety of summer programs designed to provide recreation, food, transportation, and employment for these young people.

Generally, our schedule is as follows: In March or April we find out which Federal agencies have available funds for the summer programs and how we may make application. The next few weeks—and this is typical—we are glad to get the money but it makes it very difficult when you hear in March and April and then probably by May sometimes, late May even June, before we actually know exactly what we are going to get and what the guidelines are.

The next few weeks are spent preparing reams of paper to go to the designated Federal agencies requesting the funds. Over the past decade—more often to ease or forestall urban unrest rather than meet carefully defined needs—the Federal Government has developed a variety of summer youth programs. Inadequate in scope and substance, uncoordinated and predictably late, these programs nevertheless are and have been a significant social service initiative and have come to be relied on by hard-pressed local governments and their constituents.

In May or early June, we begin to get notification of how much money we can expect and when it will be available. If we are lucky, we have 2 weeks, and right now we have people out in the high schools trying to hire the disadvantaged for employment. We go into the high schools only 2 weeks away from school getting out, and you can see it is difficult with the time.

We have already hired about seven or eight people to do the hiring. I think we could have done a much better job had I known 4 or 5 months ago that so much money would be available for the employment and for recreation.

You could put your money to the greatest advantage far more effectively and efficiently. I think we would all agree to that.

In May or early June, we begin to get notification of how much money we can expect and when it will be available. If we are lucky we have 2 weeks to hire the staff, get publicity out, sign up young people, line up jobs, buses, food, service, or whatever to get the program operating.

Obviously, such a schedule is not conducive to good planning or coordination, which means that we have to contend with the multitude of problems that should never even arise in an ongoing program.

Every summer we are confronted with a new set of guidelines and at least the one new Federal agency or office. For the past 2 years, the summer employment program in Birmingham has been handled by the Neighborhood Youth Corporation, a local OEO agency, and the youth opportunity division of the employment service. This year the only funds available for summer employment are through the EEA, Emergency Employment Act, and therefore the city itself must handle the program.

I have to take my community development department, take people out of that, put them in the schools and, of course, my community development program suffers when I have to take three or four people who are competent and put them into another area. I had to do it and do it fast.

A legislative proposal would solve once and for all the problems the city faces each year. It seems to me as the most viable course of action. It is time that we were able to plan in advance, with certainty of Federal funding available, to reallocate our scarce local resources to provide a meaningful employment program to our young people.

Both the National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors have developed and adopted policy which calls for a comprehensive approach to resolving the employment and recreation needs of the urban young. Our policy recommends that the Federal Government take the initiative in linking and coordinating the various Federal, State, local, and private resources available for youth programs.

I think this is terribly important. We have a black man in Birmingham—I am digressing—he has never been through high school but he is one of these great people that was a success. He worked. He is worth a lot of money. A. G. Gaston. You may have heard of him. He has the A. G. Gaston Boys Clubs. He puts tens of thousands of dollars of his own money into it.

Each year under a recreational support program we try to make money available so they can broaden their scope. Here we are, after the 15th of May, and I cannot tell those recreational support people—that is the different agencies we help—I can't give them any commitment. It puts a great drain on the mayor's office.

They look to the mayor. They know how I feel, that I am 100 percent for it. I bring that in as a typical example of a man, an individual, the private sector if you will, who has put up I guess $1 million through the

years and yet he has not been able to get the cooperation from us that I think he deserves.

We need the linking and coordinating of the various Federal, State, local, and private resources available for youth programs. It emphasizes that comprehensive youth services are needed not just in summer months—and this is important—but on a year-round basis. And it urges that Federal financial support for youth programs be offered in a manner more conducive to furnish an effective program development and planning in accordance with locally determined priorities and needs.

We are staying right there with the local determination. We do have and we should have that responsibility, but if you don't know when the money is coming, you don't know what your guidelines are, you are up against it. It is tough. This is my sixth year at it. It gets tougher each year I think.

Further, our policy calls for adequate funding with sufficient lead time to insure the success of these vital programs. We have indicated to the Congress on numerous occasions that a comprehensive approach to addressing the problems of our youth would be far more prudent, productive, and effective than the current haphazard, piecemeal, and last minute arrangements which have frequently wreaked havoc on carefully developed local plans. We are encouraged to note that some effort in this direction is now moving through the Congress.

I would take this opportunity to thank you—I am not through yet—but just to say I think your subcommittee and the House Labor and Education Committee is to be commended on giving this consideration. I felt very strongly on this ever since I became mayor, and I hope and pray that some good will come out of this bill. I know it is going to be tough but it will mean a lot to mayors that really are interested in young people. That is the future, the young people.

If we can get them on the right track, we will have far less drug and crime problems and they know that people care. And they know they have a purpose. I think that is so important.

We are making every effort to coordinate closely with the other agencies but the young people in our community are thoroughly confused as are many adults. Every summer they not only deal with new faces when they seek a job, but they must go to a new agency with a location different from last year with different guidelines.

If you are 16 and have not had a balanced meal in several days, it some times seems hardly worth the trouble.

Birmingham and other cities across the country need a program whereby a guaranteed minimum amount of money is available on an annual basis for employment and recreation. That is the whole story.

The money should be available on a year-round basis. The city the prime sponsor, to spend it the best way they see fit. And not just during the summer. After all, young people need jobs and recreational programs, I think throughout the year. Of course, more in the summer.

Some of the money provided by the Federal Government in the past for summer youth programs has been used to provide desperately needed recreational programs in the inner city. This money has provided more than fun and games. It provided scores of thousands of culturally deprived youngsters their first look at planetariums, art museums, zoos, symphony orchestras, and other cultural attractions in their cities.

97-526—73——3

In Birmingham, we have given them the opportunity. I had 12 busloads of them. Most of them were black, some white, that had never been to a planetarium. I took them to the airport. I had an old airplane. We had five fire engines out there. They could go aboard the plane and then we put gasoline all over the old plane and had a big fire and then showed how the firemen would come in and get that extinguished. That was a thrill.

These kids, 10, 12, 13, they had never seen anything like this. It was entertaining, but it told a story. We have a fire department that is capable of doing a job.

Thousands were able to compete in athletics or receive instructions in the theater and performing arts. While transportation is not a part of this bill, still it is terribly important because we had to have buses to get these children to different places.

Mr. HAWKINS. Do you think transportation should be added?

Mr. SEIBELS. I don't think it would do any grievance at all. I think there must be transportation. I think this. I think it should be coordinated—if the Labor Department is going to handle the transportation, or whatever department, that they work very closely with this Comprehensive Youth Act. I think the right hand should know what the left hand is doing. I don't, I really have not dwelled on that, but I know the transportation money is needed.

I am depending on it to take these young people, 62 from each city, coming for U.S. Youth Games and staying at Birmingham Southern College, and I have to get them to the stadium where they compete. I have to get them to bowling alleys and basketball courts.

I don't know yet whether I will have the money and I am trying to get the money together, $50,000. If I had known say a few weeks or months ago, then I might not have to raise as much money. I hope to get some transportation money.

Mr. HAWKINS. At the present time you have no assurance that you will get any?

Mr. SEIBELS. I have learned via the grapevine that we will. I have learned that within the last day or so. But up until I found that out, I was not sure. Up until then we were just sort of in the dark. We are delighted and appreciate the money if it comes to us.

But I think if we are going to have a good program where transportation is needed, then we should be able to know in advance. And if we don't have it, then I have to go to the bus company and say, "Can we get a special deal on these buses? Instead of charging $12.50 an hour, can you cut it to $8 or $6? And can you work at different times of the day and not one straight stretch?"

All this comes in. I think our transportation problem will probably be over because I think we will get some money. I have nothing in writing, but the source that gives it to me, I hope, is reliable.

The money should be available on a year-round basis. Young people need jobs and recreational programs throughout the year. Many cities have run the Department of Agriculture special summer food service program in conjunction with their recreational programs and as a consequence many of our disadvantaged youngsters were provided at least the one nutritious meal a day.

I am not here to talk about the food, but all this goes together, the employment, the food, the transportation, and the recreation. I don't think anybody would deny that.

We are able to hire qualified administrative personnel as they are needed. We will also be able to order needed equipment far enough in advance to assure that the equipment is delivered by the date we plan to begin using it. You need equipment for recreation.

If you don't have the money and you have a tight budget and you don't know in advance what you are going to get, it just makes it—I am being repetitious but it makes it tough. The children don't understand it. The people that are volunteering to help, they don't understand. If we knew 4 months ago what would be available, then the programs—no, not as large as we would like—would certainly operate more effectively and efficiently.

Mr. HAWKINS. How much leadtime do you absolutely need, in your opinion? You said 4 months before.

Mr. SEIBELS. Congressman Hawkins, the whole thrust here is to put this on a year-round basis and have a definite amount funded for employment and recreation: Birmingham, you get x dollars. Knoxville, Tenn., you get x dollars. San Diego, Calif., you get x dollars.

Then the prime sponsor, the city, would use that the way that they saw fit. And at least they could plan and use the dollars to the greatest advantage, but when you come in with $200,000 or $300,000 or $400,000 or $500,000 the last week in May and the children are already out of school, it brings on mayhem. It really does.

Mr. HAWKINS. In other words, you are saying that even without this act, if you continue to handle it at the present time and even had 3 or 4 months' leadtime—but without any annual expectation or any formal act which would, in a sense, by policy, commit the Federal Government to that type of coordination, that you still would have problems?

Mr. SEIBELS. Yes, sir, we would. We have had problems every year. This is my sixth summer; and I have seen it. This year it is natural, because of the changes taking place, it has been more difficult. We hope to get by with a pretty good summer; but, yes, the thrust of my message here is annual appropriation.

I think the taxpayer, the young people, the people that are administering this, the mayor, everyone would benefit by knowing in advance.

I know that seems like Utopia. But when you stop and think—I was up here for the President's Hire the Handicapped Convention 10 days ago, and I got back home and learned that $14 million would be available to 100 cities for recreational support programs.

Well, I don't know yet what I am going to get. And we are just 2 weeks from school being out.

Another message came. We had about $600,000 available for EEA money for summer youth jobs. That is good, but I had to fill out some forms, and I am going to have to fill out more forms. That is par for the course in Government. We have to fill out forms. That is part of life, but we really have not got it nailed down.

We are going ahead on the assumption we are going to get the money. I know we are. I don't know exactly how much. I would say in excess of $620,000. So it would have been much better for everybody, young people particularly—and I am repeating myself—had we known a few months ago.

I am just about through.

I would like to finish this. This is a very good point. Many of our activities require the use of large public facilities which are booked months in advance.

Under a year-round program we would no longer have to rush around at the last minute looking for a second or third choice location for a particular activity.

That might not sound like a very big problem, but when you get into June, different places have already been booked, the auditorium or different places to meet.

A year-round funding will allow us to build staff expertise in the operation of employment and recreational programs. It will allow our young people to become familiar with where to go and whom to see when they need a job or want to participate in recreational activities.

Putting the money to the best possible use, taxpayers' money, that is really what it amounts to. Year-round funding will make infinitely easier the task of what programs are available and where they may go for further information.

Finally, this is perhaps most important of all, year-round funding will allow the cities to experiment from time to time with small-scale innovative projects. This experimentation will permit us to expand those programs which are successful and to learn from our mistakes as inexpensively as possible on those which are not.

In closing, I would like to bring to your attention that the poverty-level guidelines that we work with are low. You know that. In our employment and recreational programs there are thousands of disadvantaged youths who cannot be served because they are just above the annual income cutoff.

Yet their family income is unbelievably small and they do need to be able to participate in our programs.

I realize that we cannot open the doors to everyone, but it seems we should make some attempt to serve a portion of the youngsters whose family income is only a few hundred dollars above the poverty level.

Now, that concludes my remarks. I tried to run that off with as much dispatch as possible.

I have two youngsters. Fortunately they get three square meals a day, and they are able to go to school and things like that. I am just thinking to myself. But I am also thinking of the thousands of people in my city for this summer for whom it will be tough going.

It is bad enough to have these situations, but when you have the money available, and you cannot use it to the maximum advantage because you cannot plan, that is bad.

I would like some questions.

Mr. HAWKINS. We certainly appreciate your testimony. I think it has been excellent and very helpful to this committee.

I have only one question. Mrs. Chisholm does have several.

That is: Are you testifying today, not only on behalf of the city of Birmingham, but also on behalf of the National League of Cities?

Mr. SEIBELS. In behalf of H.R. 7807, exactly.

Because I have been involved, I get out in the neighborhoods; I am one of those mayors that believes in seeing what is going on and being out there where things are going on, and I have attended every U.S. youth game.

I have been to Boston, St. Louis, New York, and Washington, and this year they are in Birmingham. But I have pretty well seen it first hand. I have good communication, not bragging, with these people that work with the young people. I meet with them, and I have meetings coming out of my ears. But I just put so much emphasis on young people.

In just 2 or 3 or 5, 8, or 10 years, they will be where we are. And it is a good investment. That is the main thing. Recreation, you know, all of that. You have heard it many times.

I will answer any questions.

Mr. HAWKINS. You have been very eloquent and helpful to the committee.

Mrs. Chisholm.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. I can really sympathize with you because before I became a State legislator and then a Federal legislator, I found it difficult to plan effectively and to coordinate effectively because the people who have the authority to make the grants for the planning do not seem to realize the money has to come in months in advance so you can make the maximum use of it. I definitely sympathize with you.

Let me say that I would like to find out from you if this is the reason that many people have indicated that many of the summer programs are not really beneficial.

I am not talking about the recreational programs. I am talking about some of the training programs that they attempt to give to the youth in various areas of this country, and the reason they are not beneficial is because at the last moment they have to go and look for kids. They have to go scouting because they do not know when the money is going to come in.

Would you say that this is one of the major reasons why spectators observing these programs feel that many of them are not beneficial—because they do not realize the amount of time that has already been lost before the officials put these programs together?

Mr. SEIBELS. Unquestionably your comments are absolutely correct. I feel a responsibility as the chief administrator of the city, and I am a fulltime mayor. I have no city manager, so you can imagine I stay pretty busy.

I feel that it is my bounded duty to try to transmit to you and to those that can do something about it the fact that these programs are not as effective as they should be.

You are exactly right. And people look at the mayor and say, "Well, I see some of these things you are doing, and it does not look to me like there has been much planning. It is so haphazard. It is not as effective. Why?"

They tell me: "You are spending six or seven hundred thousand dollars a year."

I don't like to make excuses, but I have to look them in the eye and say:

> Well, I don't think they are as effective as they could be. I don't think we are getting our dollars' worth out of them. I think some good came out of it, and I think it is better to have what we have than nothing at all.

But certainly the mayor as the chief administrator, it is up to him to try to transmit his ideas and the ideas of all those that work with

me on these summer youth jobs, to try to get the message to our friends like you, so that some corrections can be made.

I don't like people in the community, black and white, to say, "Mayor, why in the name of the Lord, didn't you get started on this back in February? We could have had this planned."

Right now in Birmingham it is quarter to nine. We have people right there in the schools now interviewing these disadvantaged young people. For instance—I met with them a week ago tomorrow—the first thing they said, "Golly, Mayor, aren't you much too late?" I said, "I have no choice."

Mrs. CHISHOLM. You often read of mayors and different persons in the cities trying to spend up a backlog of money left over before the end of the year. Would you say that this is frequently due to the fact that if you do not use that money up, you will lose it completely, even though the community and the youths need it because it did not come to you on time?

Mr. SEIBELS. I think that is true with a lot of cities. I think the whole meat in the coconut is, with 90 days or 120 days of advance notice, such as Federal funding once a year for employment and recreation, there would not have been those unspent dollars at the end where you had to scramble.

We won't say they were just wanted, but instead of getting 95 percent production out of those dollars, you probably got 50 percent. That is what you are saying, and that is the message I have been trying to say.

I am not here to chastise any of the programs of the past; this youth program, youth jobs, recreation was something that started 7 or 8 years ago, and in some cities it has worked effectively. Fortunately my city is not a real large one, like a couple of million, and I have been able to keep my hands well on what is going on and to move swiftly, but some mayors with much larger size than mine have not been able to have the insight into what was going on, and as a result the money was not used as effectively or as efficiently as ours.

We are youth-oriented in my city, and I say it with humility. We have 35 vest-pocket playgrounds all across the city, and our U.S. Youth Games—we raised $15,000 by running a story on the front page of the paper every year to send our young people off.

I think people feel strongly about young people. I have lots of people that are able to get together to work out these programs hastily and still get the maximum output from the dollar.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

Mr. HAWKINS. I certainly want to say we appreciate your testimony, Mr. Mayor.

We look forward to continuing communication with you. Maybe it will be possible for the committee to visit you during the games in your city, at which time we would be observers, not participants in the games.

Mrs. Chisholm is the only athletic member of this subcommittee.

Mr. SEIBELS. You are from California. I was born in Coronado but raised in Virginia and moved to Alabama.

It is a great pleasure to meet you both. If there is anything that any of your staff would want to know, I have people that would be glad to furnish that.

Mr. HAWKINS. Thank you.

Mr. HAWKINS. The committee is pleased to welcome a colleague at this time who, I think more than any other Member of Congress, has inspired this legislation and who is coauthor of the bill with me, H.R. 7807. I don't know of anyone who has shown any greater interest or has provided more leadership in youth activities in development of this legislation than our colleague, Mr. Rostenkowski of the Eighth District of Illinois.

At this time, Dan, it is a pleasure to welcome you before the committee.

You may proceed as you so desire.

STATEMENT OF HON. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, ACCOMPANIED BY SAM BERNSTEIN, ASSISTANT TO THE MAYOR FOR MANPOWER PROGRAMS, CHICAGO, ILL.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It is a pleasure to testify before this great subcommittee, Mrs. Chisholm. I welcome the opportunity to participate.

I would like to say that in our efforts to bring to everyone's attention the problems of our youth that exist in this country, nobody has done more than Gus Hawkins, who has spearheaded through this subcommittee our efforts, and I would like to take this opportunity to publicly acknowledge that and congratulate him.

Mr. Chairman, I have a statement which I would like to submit for the record to your subcommittee, and I would like at this time to ask unanimous consent that it be placed in the record.

Mr. HAWKINS. Without objection, the statement will be entered in the record at this point.

[The statement referred to follows:]

TESTIMONY OF HON. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

THE COMPREHENSIVE YOUTH OPPORTUNITIES ACT

Mr. Chairman. Since 1968, with the creation of the Neighborhood Youth Corps and the Recreation Support Program within the Office of Economic Opportunity, youth recreation and job programs have been poorly funded, casually administered and continually passed from one agency to another. What has resulted is a decentralized, inadequate system which carries the burden of providing 'adequate' supportive recreation and employment services to the underpriviliged youth of this country.

In 1970 the Department of Labor assumed the responsibility of administering the Neighborhood Youth Corps and the Recreation Support Program. In 1971, the Labor Department requested the "technical assistance" of the Department of Interior's Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in managing the Recreation Support Program. Various other agencies were requested to, and gave assistance. The Department of Transportation and the Department of Agriculture most notably fall into this category. At the present time, there is no mention of either program in the Administration's proposed Budget, but the President has announced that the Recreation Support Program will be funded through the Department of Labor for calendar year 1973, although it is to be administered by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Each year I have marveled at how these two programs have managed to remain even marginally productive in our metropolitan communities. It has been necessary each spring for the Congress to appropriate "crash" funds so that job and

recreation programs would be able to be provided for underprivileged inner-city youths. In 1971 the funds were made available only two weeks before the summer programs were scheduled to begin. In 1972, Manpower Regional Offices were notified one month prior to program starting dates. It would seem that, despite the obvious need in both our low income urban communities and in our underprivileged rural areas for year-round youth recreation and job programs, there has been little interest in either the Congress or the Executive branch to cope with this situation. We cannot allow this to continue. Every year there is a greater national demand for recreation and job programs for youth. It is estimated that the summer 1973 need figure will be 1.5 million slots. There will be 1.5 million young people living in underprivileged areas who are in need of jobs to stay in high school. There will be 1.5 million young people who have no organized means of recreation. It is only logical that, if the local government cannot perform these services, then the federal government should assume the responsibility for these youngsters and provide some type of a cohesive job/recreation network that can fill this growing gap in youth services.

The Comprehensive Youth Opportunities Act of 1973, H.R. 7807, would create a youth recreation and job system designed to accommodate the urban, as well as the rural demand for your-round recreation and employment programs for the disadvantaged youth throughout the country. It would establish Recreation Opportunities programs for young people ages 8 through 15, on a year-round basis. Recreation Opportunities would, for the most part, utilize already existing neighborhood recreation facilities, but, funds would be available for modifying a potential recreation sight to accommodate program needs. The primary objective of the Recreation Opportunities Title of this bill would be to make organized, flexible and imaginative recreation programs available to disadvantaged youngsters.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps component of the bill would establish a program through which young high school age youth could maintain full or part-time jobs and on-the-job training to provide them with the necessary funds either to continue their educations or to successfully support themselves. In the past, the Neighborhood Youth Corps has been the only program which gave inner-city youngsters the opportunity to learn a trade while earning a salary. It has been an amazing success and its discontinuance would have disastrous repercussions for our cities and their youth population. Because the Neighborhood Youth Corps title of H.R. 7807 specifically provides for a three part, comprehensive, year-round employment program, it lends itself easily to integration with the Recreation Opportunities program and other youth programs. What, in essence, this bill would do is establish a solid framework for youth programs—an organized, centralized authority from which could come a planned and meaningful national youth services operation.

I am convinced that this legislation is absolutely necessary if we are going to constructively attack the problems presently facing the disadvantaged youth in our nation. The Comprehensive Youth Opportunities Act could make the difference between positive growth and achievement for our young people and stagnation and frustration. It is something that must be done. It is something that we owe them.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. I know the time element is important to all of us. We are taking testimony on trade legislation before the Ways and Means Committee, and I will ask your permission to withdraw.

However, before I do that, I would like at this time to introduce to the subcommittee an outstanding member of our Chicago community, who has done outstanding work in this most important area. He is the assistant to Mayor Daley for Manpower and unfortunately he knows a great deal about the recreation problems that annually exist because the lateness of the appropriations process.

I would like, before he takes over, to mention that I could not agree more with the observations that have been made by the previous witness. I concur with the answers to the questions that were asked of him. It is not just lack of planning, Mr. Chairman, but often waste is evident. I have seen this in so many programs, where you are always afraid that in planning your budget for the next fiscal year,

that you must spend the money in the last fiscal year because of the fear somebody will cut your budget.

With this thought in mind, I hope through some method we can impress upon the executive, having the necessity of moving with greater dispatch because of the problems that we have in our city.

I would like now to introduce Mr. Sam Bernstein, who has done a great deal of research on this subject and who will reflect the views of the administration of the city of Chicago.

Mr. HAWKINS. Thank you very much.

Mr. Bernstein, we welcome you before this committee.

I know that the position which you occupy gives you the type of insight that this committee needs in developing legislation of this character. We are pleased to have you here before this committee.

Mr. BERNSTEIN. Thank you, and I deem it a privilege to be permitted and invited to participate on this important piece of legislation.

I thought before I began my more formal statement, I might address myself to one of these questions that I heard and feel is extremely important, as Congressman Kostenkowski mentioned, that is this whole problem of advance funding.

Not only is there the scurrying around to make sure that we utilize unexpended funds in order to get whatever benefit we can out of the dollars that are immediately available, but you also have the added pressure, as the Congressman indicated, of making sure that you do it because you are measured, when funds are made available in the following years by your effectiveness in spending in prior years rather than by what you accomplished; so you are under a double barrel to expend funds in ways that you would prefer not to have to.

One of the ways, it seems to me, that Congress is beginning to address itself to this subject seems to be the concept of appropriations for 2 years in the first go-around so that you always have money available for the next year whenever you are in the sequence of funding.

Some of this has already been advanced in manpower legislation, and the concept seems to have tremendous validity. It will make it possible for us to do the kind of advance planning that the members of this subcommittee have recognized as necessary. We in Chicago agree most wholeheartedly to the necessity for having the time to do a much more effective job of planning than we have been able to do.

Not only, Mrs. Chisholm, is it a problem with respect to finding youngsters, but it is equally important to hear really constructive programs; to use the youngsters that we find effectively when we are caught with this limited time in which the program has to be implemented, especially summer programs.

To launch programs even with significant funding that has been available in the past, to do it as ineffectively as we have, seems to me to be wasting resources that we sorely need.

I repeat the appreciation of Mayor Daley that you have afforded us an opportunity to appear on behalf of the Comprehensive Youth Opportunities Act of 1973.

This proposed legislation which you are considering could have an enormous impact for years to come upon the Nation's large cities. The directions you take with respect to youth opportunities will determine to a large extent how effectively the cities and their elected officials are able to respond to the needs of economically disadvantaged young

Americans for year-round recreational programs, work experience, remedial education, skills, training, and perhaps most important, a source of income to permit them to complete their high school education.

Although my chief concern is, of course, for the young people of the city of Chicago, I know that public officials across the country are deeply disturbed by the lack of real opportunities for wholesome activity for youngsters. This is a problem of particular severity among residents of our innercity neighborhoods. It is in these communities, the ghettos and barrios of our proudest cities, where we can most clearly see the deleterious effect that a lack of opportunity has on young men and women, and it is within these communities that the major impact of this legislation would be felt.

People look to local government for solutions to the broad range of urban problems that affect their lives. The Comprehensive Youth Opportunities Act of 1973 would provide local officials with the resources they must have in order to respond to the needs of their younger citizens.

I would like now to share with you some of my experiences, insights and opinions on the subject of youth opportunities.

Mr. HAWKINS. What is the youth population situation in Chicago?

Mr. BERNSTEIN. The Nation's large cities are becoming increasingly black, young, and poor. This is certainly true of my city. Nearly 25 percent of Chicago's total population is between the ages of 8 and 21. What this gives us, for example, is a youth population greater in number than the population of the entire District of Columbia. Of these 822,000 young people a half million are between the ages of 8 and 15, and 322,000 are 16 to 21.

While blacks comprise approximately one-third of Chicago's total population, they make up better than 40 percent of the city's youth population. There are in our city then more black youngsters between the ages of 8 and 21 than there are people in the State of Wyoming. When you add to this black youth population the young people of Spanish origin, there are well over 400,000 minority youth in Chicago.

And make no mistake, most of them are poor. More than one in six of our residents receive some form of public assistance. Most of them are children under 18 covered by the aid to families with dependent children program. Among all children under the age of 18 in Chicago, 26 percent are from families defined as "poor" or "near poor"; for black children under 18, the percentage of "poor" and "near poor" shoots up to 49 percent.

For these youngsters, the future is bleak indeed. Nearly one-quarter of those 16 to 21 years of age are high school dropouts. Needless to say, their chances of getting and keeping a job are not good. We figure that approximately 55 percent of our 69,000 dropouts between 16 and 21 are presently not working.

The lack of job opportunities for youth, while not the exclusive concern of the large cities, is certainly a more pressing problem for us and our young people than for those youngsters growing up in suburban communities. The movement of industry and commerce to outlying areas has left the inner-city with very few jobs for youth—whether full-time for those who have dropped out of school or part-time for those who are struggling to stay in school. This becomes even more

apparent during the summer months when the great majority of existing jobs go to the sons and daughters of the more affluent who are home on vacation from a college or university. For poor, young minority group members the situation this summer can best be described as desperate.

This is a matter of deep concern to the mayor of the city of Chicago. The severe cutback in Federal funds for summer youth programs has dealt Chicago a damaging blow. Whereas last summer we received $13.6 million to involve some 33,000 youngsters in summer Neighborhood Youth Corps work experience projects this year our summer funds have been cut by nearly $8 million. We will be getting a special allocation of $5.8 million from the Department of Labor. With this we intend to provide jobs for 13,000 young people between the ages of 14 and 22. No matter how you try to stretch it, you cannot do the same job with $5.8 million that you did with $13.6 million.

And even this special allocation, as you know, is being taken from unused discretionary funds assigned to the Secretary of Labor under the Emergency Employment Act. The Nixon administration is making available to the cities no summer NYC moneys as such. Instead, we are merely using up the funds that were held back in fiscal year 1973. And even these funds will not be available next summer. What we have, with respect to summer youth programing is a half-way measure, a cloak made up of patches—and a small garment at that.

I cannot overemphasize the negative impact these budget cuts are bound to have on life in the inner-city this summer. While Chicago's business leaders will again work closely with city officials to try and obtain summer youth jobs, they and we in government know there simply will not be enough to go around. The private sector cannot hire all of those who need and want to work. The public sector, as I have pointed out, has 20,000 fewer jobs available in 1973 than in 1972. Merchants are truly fearful of the prospect of thousands of idle teenagers who will be out of school, out of work and out of money this summer.

In the face of the Nixon administration's reduced budget for human welfare efforts Mayor Daley's Council of Manpower and Economic Advisers commissioned a study of the impact of reduced Federal spending on Chicago's economy. The Council's study concluded that:

> Choices made by the Administration in specific budget reductions have powerful adverse impacts, both economically and socially, on large metropolitan areas in general and low-income people in particular.

Heading the Council's list of concerns were the summer employment and recreation programs.

I have spent so much time today on the current summer funding fiasco simply because it illustrates the kind of urban brinksmanship we are forced to practice each year. Until local elected officials are able to do year-round youth program planning and to integrate their youth opportunity efforts within a total human welfare context, I suspect we will continue to experience the uncertainties and the frantic policy shifts which bring about hastily designed local efforts.

While it may be too late to reverse the administration's decisions about youth opportunities in the summer of 1973, I would hope that Congress will see fit to move boldly toward a comprehensive youth opportunity legislative package, such as the bill you are currently

considering. And I would further suggest that in shaping the Comprehensive Youth Opportunities Act of 1973, you give serious consideration to the importance of integrating youth planning into the total CAMPS manpower planning process. To see youth programs as an integral part of the manpower continuum would be a giant step away from piecemeal, crisis legislation which results in fragmented action at the local level.

With real long-range planning possible, local government may be able to effectively intervene in the lives of young people and combat the negative forces which now rule the lives of youngsters growing up in the inner-city.

I thin you for the opportunity to present my thoughts on a topic of such great concern to the mayor and people of the city of Chicago.

Mr. HAWKINS. Thank you, Mr. Bernstein. The chair has several questions. With respect to page 5, you speak of the legislation integrating youth planning into the total CAMPS manpower planning progress. There is now pending in another subcommittee of the Education and Labor Committee, a proposed comprehensive manpower bill.

I would assume by the statement that you have indicated here that your suggestion is that in some way the Youth Opportunities Act might be integrated with that legislation, be part of that legislation.

Mr. BERNSTEIN. Coordinated with it certainly.

Mr. HAWKINS. That is under consideration. I think your suggestion is a very good one and a very practical one. We certainly hope that will be accomplished.

Also, on page 3 of your statement you said something about a special allocation. That allocation, I assume, is the amount of money that you will be getting from the Emergency Employment Act?

Mr. BERNSTEIN. That is correct.

Mr. HAWKINS. So that while you speak of it as a special allocation, it is merely a reallocation of funds which you have already received under another program.

Mr. BERNSTEIN. Which they withheld from us. Which we would have received in essence, but withheld and then made available for a purpose that they originally actually never intended and which would have the effect of giving us, as Senator Javits said at one point, a Hobson's choice of firing the fathers in order to make summer job opportunities available for their children. This was in essence a choice which few, if any, cities can afford to exercise. We could not in Chicago because we so desperately need the employment opportunities for these disadvantaged adults who are heads of families.

Mr. HAWKINS. So the choice would probably be against the youth then?

Mr. BERNSTEIN. That is correct.

Mr. HAWKINS. That has been typical, I think. I don't know of any local official who has testified in any large city in America where we have had hearings that he could afford to support summer youth program over adult employment opportunities. So, in effect, what we are saying is that there will not be money available for the summer youth programs; that unless something is done to obtain money elsewhere, that the youth will be the ones who will suffer?

Mr. BERNSTEIN. Yes, sir, you see, the $80 million of funds that the Secretary has allocated is specifically labeled for summer programs for youth. If it is not used for that, it won't be used for anything.

But what I am saying is he also authorized the use of any Emergency Employment Act funds that you presently have available, which would mean actually firing the parents in order to make additional resources available.

Mr. HAWKINS. Is it not true that out of the $80 million to which you referred as the special earmarked amount for youth that most cities would not participate; Chicago would not get any of that money?

Mr. BERNSTEIN. Yes, sir. There are many cities that will not be getting anything on the basis of the way the formula operates, based upon the amount they have gotten from emergency employment. Cities like Los Angeles and Boston are not getting anything, or very little.

We were shortchanged in Emergency Employment Act funds, and this is a reflection of the fact that somebody came around belatedly to the same conclusion. As a result we have gotten, from the Secretary of Labor's discretionary funds, roughly one-third of what we spent last year for a summer employment program for youth.

Mr. HAWKINS. Simply because you were shortchanged on the other?

Mr. BERNSTEIN. That is correct.

Mr. HAWKINS. So that cities, in effect, which got their full allotment under the Emergency Employment Act, would not get anything of the $80 million?

Mr. BERNSTEIN. Right. That is correct.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mrs. Mink.

Mrs. MINK. I have only one question. With respect to the paltry amount of money you are getting for summer programs for youth, you say 13,000 young people between the ages of 14 and 22 will be provided with jobs. I assume that some of the jobs are going to be in programs which service other youth. Could you give us an estimate of the numbers of youth who, though not working under your program, will receive substantial benefit as a result of these 13,000 jobs.

Mr. BERNSTEIN. We have not worked out our plans as yet because we just received word of the availability of these resources. We are in the process of developing our programs. Just prior to your coming in, Mrs. Mink, we were attacking the severe problem that the cities have had of not having enough planning time for their summer programs to be able to do an adequate job when the programs are administered. Certainly this kind of question, we should have been able to answer months ago, the question you have just asked.

We are in the process really of developing our programs, so I am in no position to be able to tell you how many youngsters, the ones we are not paying, will be benefitted by those that we are paying, which is the question you asked.

Mrs. MINK. With respect to last summer, the 33,000 youngsters you said were involved, are those 33,000 youngsters only those who received some compensation or a total number benefited?

Mr. BERNSTEIN. They all received compensation. The 33,000 were Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollees and we are now reduced to approximately 13,000.

Mrs. MINK. So how many other additional youngsters, say, between the ages of 8 and 14 participated in programs under the Neighborhood Youth Corps?

Mr. BERNSTEIN. Two to three times those that were involved, actually working as Neighborhood Youth Corps.

Mrs. MINK. So you would say with 33,000 youngsters actually being paid nominal stipends as enrollees that an additional 60,000 youngsters perhaps benefited?

Mr. BERNSTEIN. Benefited directly or indirectly from their having been participants.

Mrs. MINK. I am trying to establish the multiplier effect, that although you are able to enroll and hire only a certain number, by having a summer program you multiply by a tremendous factor the number of young people affected.

Mr. BERNSTEIN. This question is so pertinent I feel it warrants much more definitive attention on our part and if I may, I would like to be able to submit more information to you for the record after I go back and actually check that out.

Mrs. MINK. My experience in Hawaii was a factor of five. If you apply this kind of evaluation it would greatly enhance the justification for this program; not just the actual numbers of enrollees that benefited directly, but the entire recreational youth program for the summer head count.

Mr. BERNSTEIN. May I have permission to submit that?

Mr. HAWKINS. That permission is granted. The record will be kept open to have that inserted following your remarks this morning.

[The information referred to follows:]

CHICAGO, ILL., *May 18, 1973.*

Hon. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Equal Opportunities,
Committee on Education and Labor,
Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAWKINS: During the course of my testimony at the May 17 hearing on the Comprehensive Yough Opportunities Act of 1973, Representative Patsy T. Mink raised the question of the multiplier effect of Neighborhood Youth Corps employment on other youth. She indicated that in Hawaii this was approximately five to one. In Chicago 32,652 Neighborhood Yough Corps participants worked directly with 366,410 other youth or a multiplier effect of eleven to one.

Sincerely,

SAMUEL C. BERNSTEIN.

Mr. HAWKINS. Again, Mr. Bernstein, we certainly thank you for your presentation. We want to express our appreciation to Mayor Daley as well as Mr. Rostenkowski for making your presentation possible.

The next scheduled witnesses are Mr. James Hadaway, executive director of Memphis, Tenn. Park Commission, and Carol Bickley representing the National Recreation and Park Association. We are pleased to have you before the committee.

STATEMENT OF CAROL BICKLEY, SENIOR ASSOCIATE, DIVISION OF SPECIAL PROGRAMS, NATIONAL RECREATION AND PARK ASSOCIATION, ACCOMPANIED BY JAMES HADAWAY, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF MEMPHIS, TENN., PARK COMMISSION

Ms. BICKLEY. We have submitted our statement and I will simply summarize it.

I am Carol Bickley, representing the National Recreation and Park Association. With me today is Mr. James Hadaway, executive director of the Memphis Park Commission. Mr. Hadaway has had consider-

able experience with the existing programs which have suggested the legislation you are considering today—the Neighborhood Youth Corps and the recreation support program.

The National Recreation and Park Association is the Nation's principal public interest organization representing citizen and professional leadership in the recreation and park movement in the United States and Canada. The National Recreation and Park Association's membership of some 18,000 includes professionals working in public park and recreation agencies, members of policy-making boards and commissions, educators, leaders in the private recreation and leisure industry, and concerned lay citizens. We are dedicated to improving parks, recreation and leisure activities.

There is a great need for an organic act to authorize this program and stabilize its funding and administration. We strongly support this proposed legislation and we congratulate the chairman, Congressman Hawkins and Congressman Rostenkowski for introducing this sorely needed act. Park and recreation departments have been one of the principal users of both the recreation support and Neighborhood Youth Corps programs. However, our testimony will center primarily on title II—Recreational Opportunities.

During the last 10 years there has been a considerable amount of Federal assistance for acquisition and development of park and recreation areas. This assistance has not even begun to touch the need for open space in our urban areas, but the hardware has at least received some attention. The software, however, is another matter. Programs and supervision can be as important, or more important than the locations but funds for recreation leadership and program equipment has been scarce, to say the least.

Federal funding for the recreation support and Neighborhood Youth Corps programs has made the difference between an opportunity for real personal development and a summer of simple diversion. These funds have allowed park and recreation departments across the country to do the special kinds of activities which would not have been possible within general city budgets. Recreation aides have been hired under NYC and recreation programs funded under RSP in a complementary way which has stretched both recreation and job opportunities as far as possible.

In the past, the recreation support program has been crash-funded and haphazardly administered. This year the Office of Economic Opportunity, which had no previous experience with the RSP, was designated to administer the program. On May 1, telegrams with very general guidelines finally went out to mayors but required that preliminary applications be postmarked no later than May 9. We do not consider this a realistic time frame nor do we feel it is a healthy situation. However, despite such problems the RSP program has continued to generate both interest and good programs at the local level. Each year, in January and even earlier, we are besieged by questions about the prospects for the recreation support program for the coming summer.

We are particularly pleased with several features of title II of the proposed Comprehensive Youth Opportunities Act. Although we see the greatest need for funding and programs during the summer months, and assume that primary emphasis will continue to fall in

that period, we are in favor of making the funds available on a year-round basis. There are many types of activities which can and should be extended throughout the school year, during after-school hours, weekends, and vacation periods, that would make recreation experiences richer for the young people who participate.

We are also pleased to see that the program will be available on a broader basis than just the 100 or so largest cities that have been eligible in the past. Many cities not presently eligible for this assistance have expressed to us interest in the program. This kind of program can have a very positive impact on the coordination of city activities and should be more widely utilized.

In our discussions about this program with people who have received RSP funds they have frequently expressed their appreciation for the technical assistance which the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation of the Department of the Interior has provided. The regional offices of BOR have helped individual cities plan and prepare programs, conduct evaluations and survey resources. Many cities have expressed their regret that BOR has not been officially involved this summer under OEO's administration of the program. We feel that the technical assistance authorization, section 201, will be of real benefit to participating localities.

I would like now to introduce Mr. Hadaway who will describe how the recreation support program and the Neighborhood Youth Corps have been used by the Memphis Park Commission. Memphis' program is one of the largest and will give you an idea of the range of opportunities available under these programs.

Mr. HADAWAY. I want to briefly tell you what happened in Memphis and I will be happy to answer any questions you might have. I think the best way is a chronological approach to the subject.

Chart I—Programs before R.S.P.

Playgrounds—Two leaders on each	137
Swimming pools	11

Chart II—Funds for summer

Regular city funds	$500,000
Special city funds	200,000
R.S.P. funds	264,000
Total funds	964,000

Chart III—Programs after R.S.P.

Day camps	70
Bus tours	400
Lunches per day	32,000
High school gyms	25
Basketball clinics	8
Free swimming periods	320
Free swimming lessons	320
Competitive swimming teams	11

Mr. HADAWAY. This is Memphis before the RSP program which started 4 years ago [indicating chart I]. We operated regular playgrounds with two leaders on each playground and we operated swimming pools on a pay-to-go-in basis. That was the extent of our program.

Our community centers were not open during the summertime and we were using no school facilities.

Now June 1, a representative from the Labor Department asked us if we would be interested in participating in the first RSP program. He told us we could expect to receive $264,000 for the program.

As you can imagine, this gave us many opportunities to move into new areas that we had not been able to program for before. We talked in terms of longer hours at our playgrounds, keeping them open later afternoons and nights. We talked about using school facilities during the summer, which we had never been able to use before. We talked about bus tours for inner-city children, to take them out to dairies and that sort of thing. We talked about day camping. We talked about the food program. This came along with the summer feeding program of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. We got into that. We opened our community centers during the summer months. We expanded a lot of cultural programs. That first summer I would like to point out we did not know until June 1 that we were going to get the money and we were expected to start spending it by June 8.

We did that and we feel like we got tremendous benefit from the program because we were a fairly large city. We have never charged any administrative costs to the program. Our fulltime people have been the administrators and therefore not only did we get full benefit from the program, but we have been able to plan fulltime because we were using our permanent staff.

The next summer there were several things that happened to us. First of all, the city got interested in more funding and I think this is an important aspect. We have been spending about $500,000 ourselves in regular city funds for our playground centers. Then we got $264,000 RSP funds. But the city got excited about some of the things we were doing and on their own appropriated another $200,000 for special city programs similar to the ones we had experimented with the summer before. So for the past several summers we have been spending almost $1 million in city and Federal funds to have an expanded program. (See chart II.)

Another thing that happened is the NYC program was enlarged and we get about 800 of those youngsters along with the $264,000 that helped us expand our program.

So going from the first chart with just playgrounds and swimming pools, we have expanded our program to include so many other things, like 70 day camps. This summer that will be 74 instead of 70, 400 bus tours, 10 tours a day from the inner city out to other areas. We feed 32,000 disadvantaged children per day on our playgrounds in the free lunch program (see chart III).

We are opening 25 high school gyms during the summertime that have not been opened before. Basketball clinics, swimming pools, the program has been enlarged. I could go on and on, but these are the major ones.

After the RSP and the additional city funds, our city last year was voted the No. 1 park system in the country for cities with over 250,000 people, primarily because of the RSP plus the increased interest of the city. We were voted No. 1 because of our expanded program and that was the result of the RSP funding.

Now, the number of youth served. In Memphis we keep a daily attendance. Every time you come to the playground for a day you are counted. In other words, for movie attendance—every time you

go to a movie we would count you. Our daily attendance totaled over 1 million, but the actual number of people served was 100,000. We were feeding 32,000 a day, that is low income. But there are other people that we did not feed that did come to the playgrounds to participate. We served over 100,000 people.

The benefits of the program. I have them outlined. No. 1, the RSP furnished jobs for about 400 youngsters that would not have had jobs. This is in addition to the Neighborhood Youth Corps funded under another program. Many of those youngsters have worked for us now for three summers. Many of them are going into the park and recreation field.

Memphis State has a degree in park and recreation management and many of our youngsters have become interested and have gone into the park and recreation field. We feel that although this is not primarily a manpower development program, it has developed interest in professions.

Many of the youngsters who have not gone into park and recreation have saved enough money to go on to Memphis State, which is a State-financed college and the tuition is very low. They have been able to save enough during the summer to pay their tuition to the university.

The second benefit is the improved quality of the conditioning program. We have always had a playground program, always had a few music and dance teachers, but with this program we have been able to improve the quality as well as the quantity.

The third benefit—the city has seen the need for these additional programs and has put money in them.

There has been a carryover value for a year-round program. Some of the equipment we have bought through this program is being used by the school board on a year-round basis. Not only were we able to use some of our mobile units like the science and nature units in our own program during the winter, but some of the other agencies in the city have used them too.

We feel like in our locality, with our experimenting with new ideas, it has stimulated even the smaller cities who have not got funding. Some of the things we have done as an innovative approach have stimulated the cities close to us to go into some of these areas with their own money, though they did not receive Federal funds.

We feel like we have cooperated more closely with other agencies. For example, our schools make the lunches rather than having them catered out. So it is a cooperative program between the school board and ourselves. We started opening the gyms during the summer and the citizens got interested in it. We went to the council and they have given us money to open them during the winter too, so the gyms in the schools are used on a year-round basis. Our community centers were not opened during the summer because of insufficient funds, but now they are operated on a 12-month basis. The health department, the YMCA, boys club, girls club, police service center, all of these agencies have been brought into this program as advisers and participators.

Now, the bad. That has been touched on more than I intended to, so I will just mention two things that we feel need improving.

One, the first year that the RSP program was funded, the Labor Department came in and said, "You are the recreation expert, Mr.

Hadaway; you tell us what you need, and we will approve it because you know your programs."

Now each year as the program has progressed, the officials at the Labor Department have become more and more experts in the field of recreation and each year it has become now them telling us what we need, rather than as it started, us telling them what we need. I think this is something we must guard against.

We are inspected and that is proper. We would put our program up against any "expert" that wants to look at it. But the Labor Department, for example—I told this to the head man in Atlanta and he agreed—needs to lean on us as they have in the past as to what we need.

The second, of course, is coming late. In answer to one of your earlier questions, we do not as yet—and today is the 17th, I believe—know what our funding level is going to be this summer for RSP. We have been trying to find out, from calling everybody in Atlanta to calling everybody in Washington, and we have been told that the appropriation is approximately the same amount as it has been in the past summers, but we have not been told what our funding level is. And, of course, our program is scheduled to start in 2 weeks' time.

So although we are happy to get it, if we would have leadtime of 4 months, it would be just out of this world. Even if we could just get a lead time of 6 weeks, it would be a tremendous help over what we have had in the past.

I would like to close with this statement. Last year in talking with a Labor Department official in Atlanta, I asked him, "Do you think they are going to continue this program?" He said: "Yes, I guarantee you they won't drop this program. It is one of the best ones they have, one of the ones that really works. The overhead is almost nonexistent. It accomplishes the purposes for which it was set out. It is popular with the recreation agencies, and we feel it is money well spent." In other words, he said this is a good program, one that really works, and we hope you all feel the same way he felt about it.

Thank you for the opportunity to appear.

Mr. HAWKINS. You dealt basically with the recreation support program, but what about NYC relationships, or do you have the relationship with NYC?

Mr. HADAWAY. Yes, sir, we do. The secret of success, I think, with any program is the leadership involved. Our in-school NYC is run by the school boards by, we feel, a great administrator. He has gotten the maximum benefit from NYC, but his program has been cut. Last year he hired about 2,500 youngsters. This year it is going to be closer to 1,200. Of those 2,500, last year we received 600 in the park and recreation program. This year we are going to still receive our 600, but some of the other agencies he has been working with will get fewer.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mrs. Mink?

Mrs. MINK. What about the summer NYC?

Mr. HADAWAY. I'm sorry, that is what I meant. There are two programs, of course, the winter and the summer. The funding level for last summer was for 2,500 youngsters. His winter level, in which we don't participate since all the winter children work in the schools, is about 500 or 600. It is being cut drastically.

I guess for every NYC job that is available in our office, we must have 10 or 15 applications. About 70 percent of the people hired under this program are low-income people.

Mrs. MINK. When did the RSP program get transferred to OEC?

Ms. BICKLEY. The program has been authorized in the past by supplementary appropriations for the Department of Labor. This year, the President decided he did not want to go that route. He announced that the program would be conducted using existing funds. Some of the funds in OEO were then designated to be used for this program. I understand at one time there was a possibility that OEO would transfer the funds to Labor to administer them, but that did not happen and OEO decided to administer the program themselves, or it was decided for them, I'm not sure which.

Mr. HAWKINS. Thank you, Mr. Hadaway and Ms. Bickley. We are very pleased to have both of you.

The next witness is Dr. James L. Jones, Special Assistant to the Mayor for Youth Opportunity Services, Washington, D.C.

We thank you for the tremendous job you are doing.

I have also a personal word to say.

We have enjoyed your friendship and association and we are very pleased that you are continuing in the same tradition that you started in. It is certainly an honor for this committee to have you testify before it.

STATEMENT OF DR. JAMES L. JONES, SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE MAYOR FOR YOUTH OPPORTUNITY SERVICES, WASHINGTION, D.C.

Dr. JONES. Thank you.

I would like to say I am particularly pleased to appear before this committee for this reason. The youth problems will not focus in the Nation until about June and July which will be too late and if we do not have things lined up and in order and some funds available we will be playing in a losing game.

I have prepared a statement for the committee which I would like to submit for the record and I would like to highlight some of my impressions about the need for such a bill.

I am special assistant for the mayor for Youth Opportunity Services. As such, one of my roles is to coordinate all youth programs.

In reviewing this bill, this city and my office in particular fully supports it.

I would like to not go into the mechanics of the bill but I would like to talk about why it is so greatly needed so that our Nation can begin to really plan for the young people.

I would like to talk initially about the employment section.

Mr. HAWKINS. Your statement will be entered in the record at this point.

[Statement referred to follows:]

STATEMENT OF DR. JAMES L. JONES, SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE MAYOR FOR YOUTH OPPORTUNITY SERVICES, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. Chairman, I am Dr. James L. Jones, Special Assistant to the Mayor-Commissioner for Youth Opportunity Services in the District of Columbia. I should like to take this opportunity to express my sincere appreciation for the privilege of appearing before you today.

I have studied the bill now before you which deals with the problem of youth employment and year-round recreation. The Office of Youth Opportunity Services of the District of Columbia Government wholeheartedly endorses this bill. My testimony will not concentrate on the specifics or mechanics of the bill, but will focus on why such a bill of this nature is so vitally needed for this country, and is particularly important to youngsters who live in the ghettoes of our urban centers.

This bill goes to the very heart of the problem confronting so many of our youngsters today. From the experiences which I have had in working with young people in the District of Columbia, their loudest cry is for employment—both those youngsters in and out of school. This demand for jobs used to start at 16 years of age. However, we find that youngsters as young as 10, 11, and 12 years of age want to work and are serious about the business of work.

Therefore, some program such as this must be designed to satisfy this need if we are to nurture our youngsters in the proper vain for them to be highly productive citizens. The income which these youngsters will receive from these jobs, which will provide for their most basic needs, is only one factor. Equally as important is that they need to have the proper work experience. The monies provided for in this bill will contribute greatly towards delivering the types of jobs that will be beneficial in that area.

Because of various restrictions and work laws regarding youth in America, it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, for a youngster below the age of 14 to get any type of work. Traditionally, American youngsters of that age have been engaged in delivering papers, cutting grass, helping around the house, and doing general cleaning or domestic chores; and the funds for the monies that they receive from these chores are generally from local neighbors and parents, which is more in the form of an allowance.

All of us know too well that there are no provisions for allowances in an inner city, poor family. As a result, these youngsters have little or no opportunity to earn any money or engage in any meaningful work. If this is the case, then it is incumbent upon us to seek solutions to this problem, such as you are presenting in this bill—a community year-round recreational program which will address itself to the problems of youngsters under the age of 14. This is not to say that this program of recreation will solve all of their problems, but it will go a long way in providing them with the kinds of meaningful activities that will preclude them from engaging in anti-social behavior or acts and insure that they engage in some meaningful activity of a recreational nature.

Many cities and counties have recreation departments which have a mandate to provide this service and some function better than others. However, this bill focuses on a population that in many cases traditionally has not taken full advantage of normal recreational activities, and sociologists could talk for days about why. But, this bill is directed toward doing something about providing recreational activities for inner-city youngsters on a year-round basis that will complement and supplement existing recreational programs in various cities.

It is a generally accepted theory that where there is a special need then special attention ought to be given to that special need to include providing the necessary resources. And, since recreation for inner-city youngsters is a special problem then this bill is certainly proper and fitting.

One of the strengths of such a bill is that it would allow the various local communities to really fashion the types of programs that the young people are now demanding. The traditional recreation concept is being seriously challenged and what was once considered recreation for inner-city youngsters now appears to be diminishing in its attractiveness. They are concerned with employment, developing a skill that will lead to some type of vocation; they are interested in their environment and in their fellow man. They are no longer interested mainly in hula hoops and plastic balls and bats. These types of activities are still important but the afore-mentioned interests are rapidly coming into focus as a major part of that complex.

As a result of youngsters looking at T.V., the high rate of mobility within the inner city, and the exchange of information about worldly events, activities must be designed to facilitate this kind of appetite.

One has to examine and perhaps redefine within the con'ext of the inner-city youngster the meaning of recreation. For, young people of today see recreation as the ability to select various programs within their community in which to participate; and at any point and time they desire, they must be able to leave that particular activity and go to another and have the wherewithall, transportation wise, to do it.

It is impractical today for any city to attempt to design recreational programs that would attempt to have a youngster staying in the same place or activity all

day. The very nature of young people today is to move about and become engaged in a variety of activities.

A typical day for a youngster who does not have a job would perhaps be: swimming in the morning, playing a little basketball just before noon, going to one of the City's Summer Feeding Programs and getting a little lunch, hanging out with the boys awhile from about 1 to 3 and from 3 to 5 going to a recreation center to engage in some quiet games or a game of pool, and then going home, picking up his uniform to play baseball or some other organized team sport; when he has finished, going home, perhaps getting dinner, and then picking up his electric guitar to go out and play with a local group connected with the recreation department. This is perhaps the kind of day you could expect an inner city youngster who does not work to be engaged in. This bill would allow that type of program design to be implemented for inner city youngsters with the necessary transportation capabilities to facilitate the many social, cultural, and recreational activities in which they like to be engaged.

As stated before, for some reason the traditional view of recreation for inner city youngsters have been bats, balls, and hula hoops. Now they are interested in photography, filmmaking, music, drama, racing cars, motorcycles, and developing a skill to enable them to make money in the future.

In conclusion, if there is one thing I would like to stress before this committee it is that this country in the the last five years has traditionally waited until the last minute to notify youngsters in the inner city that they would have jobs the coming summer. Cities do not receive, until very late, information as to the number, kind, type, and quality of youth employment. It has always been a last minute "We think it might come" type of situation.

This type of funding has heightened the type of anxiety in the inner city youngster of not knowing whether or not there will be any jobs at all to the point that many of them spend the months of May and part of April cutting school and looking for jobs, because no one is able to tell them in enough time that jobs will be available. Therefore, one can easily see the disastrous affects on a youngster who really needs a job and wants a job and still wants to stay in school, but must make a choice—and, that choice is usually to cut school because he *must* have a job.

If this bill does nothing else, it is my sincere hope that all cities will have the type of funds on a year-round, known basis that will provide "X" number of jobs so that youngsters and cities will know what is available. This would alleviate the student from worrying about a summer job and jeopardizing his education to secure one.

Mr. HAWKINS. You may proceed.

Dr. JONES. I would like to talk about the employment section.

In these past 5 or 6 years, it has been the pattern to fund youth employment programs at the last minute, even after 3 years, 4 years of NYC-type programs, cities would not know until the last minute how many slots would be available. What this approach has done to the youngsters of our country is to condition them to not know what their future holds in terms of employment.

As a result, many youngsters who want jobs start looking in April and May and consequently leave school. The Government is not able to say how many slots will be available. Those youngsters start looking about April and May. And this is the kind of conditioning that is happening to any city youngsters that we need to vitiate.

If this bill is passed, one of the things that it will do, it will allow cities to know how many jobs they can produce and in turn provide that information to the young people.

One of the problems we have in this city is trying to encourage youngsters to stay in school up to the last day of school and study rather than hitting the streets around the 15th of May or earlier trying to find jobs.

Just this year the NYC program has been eliminated. We still are not certain whether or not we will have funds for summer programs.

We have had an indication that money could be forthcoming from the EEA program, emergency employment program.

I testified before Senator Birch Bayh yesterday and he indicated that that problem has not been settled in Congress, whether or not those funds are to be used.

So, if this bill is passed, it will for once and all settle the problem of earmarking moneys early enough for youth employment.

In that aspect the bill has another component which is the recreational component. And even though we have recreation departments functioning in most major cities, for the inner-city youth, for whatever reason they have not taken full advantage of these facilities.

We know that sociologists can talk forever about why they don't take advantage of them. But we do know that that is a fact, that they do not.

This bill addresses itself to the problem here and now. The 13, 14, 12, and 11-year-olds, they need something to do.

A recent trend in employment, we find that even youngsters at that age want jobs. In fact, we used to worry about the 16 and above. Now, is is 14. I have coming to my office daily youngsters 13 and 12.

I think we have to maybe look and redefine recreation. I am not so sure that the traditional bats and balls concept and hula hoop still holds due to the fact that the inner city youngster has seen a lot by television, the high mobility in getting about and the worldly involvement, and as a result it is difficult to contain him in that old concept.

We might be talking about a combination of work and recreation for youngsters.

We might be talking about the kind of supplemental recreation programs that will complement and supplement the existing programs.

In the forties, fifties, and sixties youngsters were herded into programs in recreation centers and expected to stay all day. Now the pattern is for youngsters 11, 12, and 13 to get up at 11 o'clock, or 10. They might want to go swimming. Of course you are hungry after you swim you seek food.

The free food program in many of the cities has taken care of that problem by having the lunch program. They used to steal from the Safeway the soda and the potato chips.

After that they might just hang out a little while. Then they might go to a recreation center and play pool. Later on that afternoon they can pick up a uniform and play baseball. That would last until 6.

Then they would go home and perhaps get a meal. If the recreation program that you proposed is in effect, they maybe could pick up an electric guitar and play with a night group and at the end of that perhaps be tired enough to go to bed.

I say that because with your bill and the moneys available, that money will allow communities to plug those gaps and not expect to herd a youngster into one program all day.

This poses another problem of accountability. It is difficult to determine the number of youngsters to participate in a program and report back because they would have a variety of programs. I say this is in the tradition.

This mobility is the same pattern that adults have in their recreation. The only difference is they have the money to do it.

So if we are to stem antisocial behavior and provide a meaningful behavior concept a youngster has to have a choice and it cannot be

a forced choice. There must be sufficient variety of programs that he would want to go to. We ought to try to talk about the quality of programs. The RSP grant has provided the type of incentive so that people can be creative. Youngsters are interested in photography, filmmaking, automobile mechanics, writing, arts—these things are hard to come by.

How many recreation centers in major urban centers can afford a $150 camera? They might buy the little Polaroid but we don't make photographers for newspapers and magazines with Polaroids.

This says another thing about what people expect from inner-city youngsters as education and recreation. I had a difficult time convincing an RSP administrator we don't want to buy expendable items. We want to buy cameras. We want to buy instruments for youngsters in bands. We want to get the type of equipment that a person could enjoy and learn from and have for 2 or 3 years.

We pushed that through in view of the stringent regulations. So what we are trying to do is look at the inner city because somehow many people see the inner-city black youngster as wanting to do nothing but dance and hang out.

But when you look around at the marching bands, when you look around at some of the photography, when you look around at the drama and the writing, these are the kinds of things that we want to get into. We play good basketball and we play very good football and baseball but if it takes Gordon Parks 40 years to make a film simply because he started when he was 39, then we are in serious trouble about training our young people, and photography and filmmaking is a traditional part of the past time of America.

So what I see in this bill is the opportunity for cities to really provide that type of recreation that youngsters want and need and must have to matriculate in this society and not waste their time. We see recreation as part of education, inextricably bound so that if you do one you get the other.

This highlights my testimony, and I would be open for any questions and be happy to address myself to them.

Mr. HAWKINS. Dr. Jones, it is hard to suggest a question because I think your testimony is so clear and excitingly new in its presentation that I certainly want to commend you on the job you are doing and on the thought you bring before this committee.

We sometimes, I think, get a little technical ourselves and look at legislation from a purely legislative point of view without realizing that it requires a little bit more than that.

May I ask you about the present situation, because this legislation is, of course, long range.

We have the immediate problem of what to expect this summer due to inadequate funding and failure to plan.

With respect to the District of Columbia—of course you are in a little different situation than other cities—but have you been assured of what funds will be available to you in terms of summer youth programs?

Dr. JONES. We have received in the area of jobs—the Mayor indicated we would receive approximately $3.6 million for youth employment. That would be coming from two sections of Labor Department formerly funding the EEA and also some discretionary

moneys coming from revenue sharing constituting a sum of $3.6 million.

Mr. HAWKINS. As compared with what last year?

Mr. JONES. Compared with $6 million for the whole metropolitan area and $5 million for Washington, D.C. which produced 11,000 jobs, NYC type.

We have produced with that amount of money about 9,000 jobs, but we have cut out all of the subcontractors and overhead. I received a mandate from the Mayor that the District government will implement this program and the overhead will be very, very low.

So we are working on a 3-percent overhead and I was asked to cut that back. I happen to concur because during NYC we had too many contractors, too many counselors counseling counselors. So we were able to come up to last year's level by making that cut and we felt some repercussion. We are telling contractors now either the job is for adults or young people and the mandate is for young people.

So if that money is forthcoming we will be at the level, but our need in the cities if every youngster who wants to work is taken care of—our need is 50,000.

That includes corps, returning college youth, poor youngsters, nonpoor youngsters.

One thing I want to say, if the bill goes through I think we ought to make provisions for those youngsters who are not poor. I say that because we are doing something to the young people of this country. We are forcing them to lie on an application to get a job and questioning their integrity, and we don't need a lack of integrity of our young people at this point in time.

So some provision must be made in a small percentage where if a youngster is not poverty he can get in without prosecuting his integrity.

Mr. HAWKINS. Would you open it up completely or what limits would you put in?

Dr. JONES. What we have done with the Washington Youth Corps, we set 50 percent for youngsters on welfare, 30 percent for youngsters meeting the poverty and near poverty and 20 percent for nonpoverty youngsters which means that in an allocation based on the geographical spread we can expect in innercity 100-percent poor, but when we moved to Rock Creek Park, Blagden Terrace, we can expect that 20 percent to be filled and it is incumbent on that community to find the other 80 percent who are poor because we know they are there and only on proof they are not there are we going to extend that. I think we need that flexibility.

The year before last I had six affluent young ladies come into my office. I said "What kind of car are you driving?" "Mustang, Volkswagon—but we want to work. We need the work and we want that experience." I said "But you don't need the money." They said "No."

I called their parents. The parents said, "We are having a problem because she really wants to work."

That is a hell of a dilemma to put a young girl in, to say you cannot work because you are not poor, so that is a problem we are hasseling with that I think the country should look at.

The recreation support—we received information that would be coming from OEO, which we could not understand, and then we had

to call around; BOR people informed us and finally we had to call them to find out they had the money and I sent a message over. I am fortunate I could send someone on M Street and pick up the guidelines which consists of two pages. That proposal will be going forward today.

The deadline was yesterday. The original deadline was the 9th. I told the people it is incredulous you think we can put a $200,000 program together like that. I will make available to you our application for that program.

Mrs. MINK. Backdate one for Hawaii.

Dr. JONES. We hope we have the grace period so, but we could not get it. We will keep you informed of the progress.

Mr. HAWKINS. Thank you, Dr. Jones.

Dr. JONES. Thank you for holding these hearings.

Mr. HAWKINS. The final witness today is Mr. Milton Morris, president of National Association of Neighborhood Youth Corps Directors. He is accompanied by Mr. James Chavis from Baltimore, Md., NYC.

Mr. Morris and Mr. Chavis we are pleased to have you.

Do you have a written statement?

STATEMENT OF MILTON MORRIS, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS DIRECTORS, ACCOMPANIED BY JAMES CHAVIS, DIRECTOR, BALTIMORE, MD., NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS

Mr. MORRIS. We thank the committee for inviting us to testify. We have entered prepared statements.

We have taken all parts of NYC, in school, out of school, summer, and rural programs and we have presented to you as papers.

Some of this information was presented to the Department of Labor sometime ago.

Our Association has been trying hard to work with the Department of Labor and in some cases with Members of Congress. We recognize the need of a comprehensive youth program, the one you are suggesting today and sometime ago to the Department of Labor in a different form of course.

We feel that Neighborhood Youth Corps is a program which should be saved. We have been attending around the country various meetings sponsored by the Department of Labor to introduce us to what is to come in NYC. These meetings have turned out to be wakes where the Department of Labor is saying to the NYC Director "We don't know where you are going this summer. We don't know where you are going this fall." We know that the administration has proposed to eliminate the various manpower programs and instead introduce what is known as manpower revenue sharing. We also have been advised that the administration has tried to—I understand from my weekly manpower news weekly that—the administration made an attempt to give back appropriated funds for summer Neighborhood Youth Corps. Those funds would have funded the Neighborhood Youth Corps this summer. We also are new in the field.

I am speaking for directors throughout the country. We also know in the field that Senator Javits has introduced an amendment to supplement an appropriation calling for additional funding of summer

Neighborhood Youth Corps in the amount of $477 million to fund 1,018,000 slots this summer. His figure is based on research done by National League of Cities, U.S. Conference of Mayors.

Mr. HAWKINS. What was that amount?

Mr. MORRIS. $477 million.

Mr. HAWKINS. How many slots?

Mr. MORRIS. 1,018,000.

We also know that EEA funds are not available uniformly to all cities. I receive calls in my office as president of a national association daily from directors complaining that they will not have summer programs this summer or they have been greatly reduced this summer. But above all of that we have many innercity fights as to who will sponsor this program this summer.

Therefore, what is being created is ambiguity throughout the country which is effecting the reduction in enrollees participation. It is also calling for the various staff members, qualified staff members to seek employment elsewhere.

So what we find, Mr. Chairman, is that this summer, even though there may be a NYC program we may not have the true operators or the true counselors or the true people who are dedicated to the purposes and goals of NYC.

We are therefore asking this committee to do whatever possible to give some light to the many enrollees and to the many staffs and the many cities and communities throughout this country.

I would also like to ask that our testimony concerning "In-school and summer components," and also the testimony which is being presented by an advisory board from the city of Cleveland be entered in the record and considered.

Mr. HAWKINS. All of your documents in their entirety will be entered into the record at this point.

[Information referred to follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF MILTON C. MORRIS, PROJECT DIRECTOR, CLEVELAND NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS, CLEVELAND, OHIO

My name is Milton C. Morris. I am the director of the City of Cleveland out-of-school NYC II program and national president of the National Association of NYC Directors. I would like to thank this committee for granting me the opportunity to offer testimony today in support of the "Comprehensive Youth Opportunities Act of 1973." The NYC program was a product of the "Hot Summer" riots of the 60's. Hastily conceded as a means to keep the inner-city youth off the streets and into various areas labeled "meaningful work experience." For that time and purpose, NYC met the challenge. Through the years, the summer became cooler and proposal writers in Washington revamped the program to meet that climate they introduced for the urban areas a comprehensive out-of-school NYC program called NYC II. This program, while still providing a limited amount of work experience, introduced:

A. Enrollee employability plans.
B. Pretesting and assessment.
C. Greater social and educational counseling.
D. Medical care; and
F. Cultural enrichment.

After some minor modifications, this program was well received by the enrollees and staff of NYC. It allowed for many success stories of enrollees returning to and completing high school, Jr. colleges, and the various vocational and skill training schools.

Our program in Cleveland could produce pages of success stories as could other programs in many other urban cities. Many of these stories have been carried in the local news media.

However, like other NYC programs, NYC II, because of its national guideline does not completely meet the local needs, i.e., it is within the guidelines to send enrollees to continuation school at night in some cities while in other cities attending continuation school during the day is not.

The other NYC program, the summer, the in-school and the rural also experienced changes. There were the innovated "NYC Goes to College", "Vocational Exploration in Private Industry", the "Children's T.V. Workshop" and "Youth Tutoring Youth". Unfortunately, the many changes in NYC did not completely satisfy the Department of Labor and others whose measuring questions forever loomed . . . *How many persons did you keep in school?* and, *How many jobs have you found?* The cry became ever present to the point where it changes to "*How many jobs have you created?* The answer to that question can be found in the Bureau of Labor Statistics. There were other problems confronting NYC.

The problem of implementation of a summer program when there is a delay in receiving funds.

The problem of locating free vocational training and the lack of allocated funds in the budget.

The problem of motivating 14- to 18-year-old youth to return to a world where they have been rejected.

And the lack of coordination between the various manpower programs created by the various agencies which have potential for serving youth.

Cleveland and the many other cities need a comprehensive manpower youth program which will encompass all of the present youth organizations and agencies. There are a number of advantages, the chief of which is that each disadvantaged person would have the complete range of manpower services available to him, and he would be directed into that program best for him. Such a program would eliminate the overlapping of the many agencies and administratively allow for a greater flow of funds to the clients in the way of additional supportive services.

The "Comprehensive Youth Opportunities Act of 1973" allows the beginning of such a program by combing the present NYC programs and adding to them the needed recreation and transportation.

STATEMENT OF THE CIVILIAN NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS ENROLLEE ADVISORY BOARD

We the enrollees of the Neighborhood Youth Corps are grateful to you the people who are willing to give us a second chance, in life, and for some of us this is our third and fourth go around in an effort to find ourselves in our so widely spread society. We thank you earnestly.

We appreciate your efforts, but in one manner of speaking what's the use of getting us started and then so abruptly turning away from us. Sure, you allow us two years on the program to accomplish what? Many of the enrollees drop out of school before reaching the 10th grade. Then again, others before the 9th grade. Two years is hardly enough time to really complete high school, let alone reach a goal. You know as well as we the enrollees, that it takes so much more than just simply a high school diploma to go forth and pursue substantial employment.

With more time, determination on the enrollee's part specific goals can be accomplished. Here is a list of enrollees who have accomplished some specific goal during their term on the N.Y.C. program:

Clementine Williams: Completed High School at Adult Ed Center. Will be graduating from Cuyahoga Community College in June of 1973.

Theresa Lee: Graduated from Street Academy with honors. Presently attending Cleveland State University, Sophomore.

Michael Baker: Graduated from Glenville High, attending Kent State University. Freshman year.

Maude Kathy Shaffer: Graduate of John Kennedy and Barbizon School of Fashion. Now attending Kent State as a Freshman.

Sherrie Robinson: Graduate of Work Study, will begin employment at Cleveland Board of Education on May 18, 1973.

Anna Cruz: Attended West-Side Work Study. Trained at Tremont Free Clinic as a Community Worker and Clinic Assistant. Presently employed at the Community Information Service at the Carnegie West Library.

James Pennington: Great personal effort, progressing through Adult Education. Exceeded all expectations. Presently in Maintenance Training.

Judith Chatman: Graduated from Adult Education. Majored in Secretarial skills. Was accepted at Dyke College. Presently employed through the May Co.

Gail Knight: Attended West Side Work Study. Trained at the Tremont Free Clinic. Presently employed through the Cleveland Public Library as a Community Worker.

Charles St. Clair: Attended the Fairmont School of Creative and Performing Arts. Presently Associate Director of Fencing at the Fairmont Center.

These enrollees were able to accomplish these things because they were given the time. They have just about reached their goals.

By our merely pointing out these few enrollees and their accomplishments we are hopeful that you can understand the need for extensions to be granted and the necessity to continue to stand behind the many enrollees who are willing and want help.

SCHOOLS' NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS,
CLEVELAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Cleveland, Ohio, May 16, 1973.

Congressman AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Equal Opportunities, Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The In-School Neighborhood Youth Corps Program has become a vital part of every large city school system throughout the United States. The basic program design as provided through the Equal Opportunity Act of 1964, Title I–B, provides for part-time employment, on-the-job training, and useful work experience to students from low income families who are in the 9th through 12th grades of school (or who are of an age equivalent to that student) and are in need of earnings to permit them to resume or to remain in school attendance.

With these guidelines, sponsoring agencies such as the Cleveland Public Schools developed a total program focused on the student but involving the family, the school and the entire community. The following goals were established:

1. To enable youth to continue school.
2. To develop sound work habits and attitudes stressing the dignity of work.
3. To provide public service in the community.
4. To build aspirations, develop motivations and to enhance positive self concept.
5. To prevent possible school drop out.
6. To provide a small income (school year weekly average is 9 hours a week or $14.40—summer vacation average is 26 hours a week or $41.60).

Why is a program such as the In-School Neighborhood Youth Corps of value? The answer is that it meets a vital need, it supports the ability and desire of youth to continue their education and training for the future before they become a statistical casualty. We all recognize the requirement for formal preparation for entry into the world of work. For many students actual work experience is also necessary to gain public exposure, to review occupational opportunities, and to earn supportive funds. The discipline of work, the demands of an on-site supervisor, the joy of personal earnings, and the maturation of on-the-job training all satisfy this need for personal growth.

Recent limited studies gave some indication that Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollees were not being selected properly, that their drop-out potential was insufficient even though they met the basic requirements of age, in-school status and poverty background. The question must be asked, "why do students drop out of school and what sort of effort has the Neighborhood Youth Corps made to stop the flow of the drop out?"

Students leave school for the following reasons:

1. Lack of family interest in education.
2. Inadequate curriculum.
3. Maladjustment to school curriculum.
4. Emotional instability in the family.
5. Financial pressure.

In the limited exposure the In-School Neighborhood Youth Corps has to its enrollees, all of these major reasons for dropping out of school cannot be resolved. Possibly some degree of each may be reduced, but realistically, only two reasons might be overcome; first the financial pressures may be resolved through subsidized earnings, and secondly, an adjustment to school curriculum may be made through counseling.

A city the size of Cleveland has an approximate secondary school age population of 50,000 youth of which 19,000 might be eligible to participate in the In-School Neighborhood Youth Corps Program. For the last four years, the United States Department of Labor quota of only 886 students could be served. What impact can that number have on the drop-out rate? It is helpful, however, to share the results of a study conducted by the Division of Educational Research of the Cleveland Board of Education which indicated that the school drop-out rate of students enrolled in the In-School Neighborhood Youth Corps Program was only three percent as compared to the 14.5 percent rate of the schools they attended. That school attendance improved and that statistically significant improvement was found in enrollees work habits and self-estimates of success. Further, the study indicated that enrollees maintained their grade level and perceived teacher and peers in a more positive manner. A follow-up study to the summer program of 1972 reveals that over four out of ten (41%) of the respondents indicated that their summer SNYC experience made a difference in their intention to return to school.

The respondents self-rating in work-related characteristics indicated *very much improvement* in the rollowing areas: sense of responsibility (74%), following directions (70%), sense of promptness and attendance (68%), getting along with others (61%), budgeting money (57%), seeing connections between school learning and job skills (53%), and community awareness (43%).

The In-School Neighborhood Youth Corps takes the position that too little is being done to help youth, nurtured in poverty, to realize their potential to enter the world of work. Their need to build success is vital. Their avenues are limited. The schools with federal assistance are in a unique position to coordinate all the positive aspects of youth experience and to accentuate the strengths of the community resources through work experience in a vital plan for the future.

We recommend, not only the continuance of the In-School Neighborhood Youth Corps, but its expansion. As a preventive type program with special projects such as: Vocational Exploration of the Private Sector, SNYC Goes to College, Youth Tutoring Youth, Summer Program of Action to Renew the Environment, Vocational Education Training, and Sesame Street, it should be given sufficient funds to allow every eligible student an opportunity to success. More specifically, the following recommendations are made:

1. Safeguard the youth training opportunities for eligible students under whatever avenue the revenue may take in the future.
2. Improve opportunities for youth to participate in work-training programs by providing realistic guidelines, valid goals and adequate funding.
3. Emphasize prevention in youth work-training programs. Youth in school require the additional personal attention and counseling of program staff and concerned work supervisors. Their earnings allow them to meet the individual needs for clothing, transportation, and supplies. The work assignment itself can provide instant success and job satisfaction that reinforces the need for additional education.

The eligible youth of Cleveland should be guaranteed an opportunity to earn desperately needed money to complete their education, should receive orientation to the world of work, and the opportunity to become self-reliant, productive citizens in our nation.

Enclosed find the annual report of the Cleveland Schools' Neighborhood Youth Corps Program.

Very truly yours,

LAWRENCE S. DUDA,
Project Director.

Enclosure

IN-SCHOOL AND SUMMER COMPONENTS

INTRODUCTION

The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended, provides for financial assistance to "students from low-income families who are in the ninth through twelfth grades of school (or are of an age equivalent to that of students in such grades)." NYC provides services to these students through the in-school and summer components.

Both the in-school and summer components have the same program objective to help youth from low-income families stay in school and one component should be the natural extension of the other. However, more often this is not the case. Summer projects have more enrollee opportunities than the in-school projects, necessitating enrollee terminations at the end of the summer program. Late

funding of the summer program or portions of it often prohibits the development of quality projects.

The need for a year-round NYC program serving disadvantaged students is evident. It is proposed that the in-school and summer components be combined into a Year-Round In-School (YRIS) program which would be funded in one contract and be designed as one continuous program. In the event that summer supplemental funds were appropriated, these funds would be used to develop a Special Summer Program (SSP) in selected areas, separate and distinct from the YRIS program.

The program

The YRIS program must be constructed to provide flexibility in adapting projects for all geographic areas urban and rural. The YRIS program would continue to provide financial assistance to enrollees, however, while the enrollee is in the program he should receive more than just work experience. The program should contain imaginative features which will enable the enrollee to complement his formal education with related work experience. Job site development and coordination with other programs, and agencies, must provide meaningful opportunities for development of the enrollees' interests and capabilities.

To enrich the services provided to in-school enrollees, the YRIS program would emphasize (1) work experience that is related to the enrollees vocational aspirations and plans, (2) improving enrollee academic performance, and (3) vocational exploration to prepare enrollees for post-high school entry into a job or higher education. The mix of services which would be available will depen on the size of the community and the availability of sources.

Components of the YRIS program would be as follows:

A. YRIS school year phase

1. Enrollee participation during the school year phase would be 10 to 15 hours per week. Local school systems would be called upon to design special curricula and schedules so that participants in the YRIS program could gain maximum benefit from all program components.
2. Compensation for all program participation would be provided.
3. Remedial education would be provided to assist enrollees in reaching and/or maintaining maximum academic achievement.
4. Supportive services including vocational counseling, testing, tutoring, etc., would be available.
5. Meaningful worksites for work experience would be developed to (a) provide explorations into various occupations of the world of work, (b) provide skill development and training related to a chosen vocation or interest. Both private-sector and traditional worksites would be utilized.
6. Cultural enrichment programs would be developed, career days, and presentations by local leaders, NYC graduates, and other achievers in the public sector as well as private industry.

B. YRIS summer phase

1. Enrollee participation during the summer would increase to 25–40 hours per week.
2. Compensation would be provided for all program participation.
3. The remedial education and/or tutoring provided would be a continuation of the same services offered in the in-school phase.
4. Supportive services that complement the regular school curriculum would be offered such as vocational counseling, testing, enrichment features, etc.
5. For those enrollees with stabilized vocational goals, work experience sites would remain constant throughout a program year for maximum enrollee development. If the seasonal closing of schools prohibits this, then new but similar job sites would have to be arranged. For example: An enrollee whose vocational choice is librarian may be assigned to the school library but during summer months would be assigned to the public library.

In-school enrollees are often in need of assistance and services not normally available in the school setting. YRIS sponsors would be called upon to develop strong linkages with community services such as legal aid, public health service, community colleges, welfare agencies, etc. In addition, coordination with the Employment Service (ES) would be essential, particularly for job development for seniors. The ES should also be the community conduit for various manpower services to which enrollees may be referred. Out-reach into rural areas using the

mobile team concept might be developed. The employability plan and team approach can be a valuable tool for rural in-school sponsors remote from services essential to this program.

The special summer program (SSP)

1. Preference for participation in this program would be given to those eligible school youth unable to enroll in the YRIS program due to funding limitations.
2. A second priority would be the enrollment of individuals identified by school counselors as dropouts who are interested in returning to school but due to one of the following factors have been prevented; lack of financial support, lack of interest or family pressures. These individuals should be involved in the intensive counseling support, remedial education, tutoring and work experience.
3. Worksites for work experience would be those that are mutually beneficial to the enrollee as well as the community and particularly, seasonal, i.e., recreation, community betterment, etc. Employment in private sector training facilities to expose youths to the world of work, career possibilities, and practical on-the-job training would be included.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Jim Chavis is here today to speak for out-of-school component of Neighborhood Youth Corps. After his presentation I would like to have the opportunity of summarizing.

STATEMENT OF JAMES CHAVIS

Mr. CHAVIS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to touch on two areas. One to say what is happening to the out of school Neighborhood Youth Corps and to the Neighborhood Youth Corps in general as the administration implements its concept of manpower revenue sharing and to share with you some of the things we have on low-income youth, out-of-school youth in many urban areas, and to use Baltimore as an example.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps in Baltimore is sponsored by a community action agency program.

As the concept of revenue sharing is being implemented, even though to the out of school Neighborhood Youth Corps and to the Neighborno revenue sharing manpower law exists on the books, the Labor Department is proceeding as if such a law existed. The CAMPS Committee put together a plan submitted to the Regional Office, Department of Labor. This plan because of the reduction in money that all areas are experiencing, eliminates totally the out-of-school Neighborhood Youth Corps program in Baltimore. This is done we are told of the shortage in money and to get the maximum benefits out of money available. But we find from our experience with the association this is happening in other areas around the country. What appears to be developing is that out-of-school low-income youth are not hypothetical priorities in many areas and therefore they get short-changed.

They do not have powerful spokesmen where the decisions are made. This particular group comes out on the low end. That is why we are so pleased and want to support the Comprehensive Youth Opportunity Act of 1973 that this subcommittee is considering.

I think it is very basic that youth, especially low-income youth and out-of-school youth, ought to receive service in most urban areas of this country. But cities given bloc grants of money with no guidelines and no program guides will serve those groups that they must serve or that they feel they must serve and it was our experience as coming from around the country now that in many cases the out-of-school low-income youth are not given much priority.

Speaking as a black man in exploring the whole concept of revenue sharing, to many white people in urban areas, total revenue sharing, total giving bloc grants of money to cities with no strings is seen to some degree as States rights through the back door, and therefore we approach it with a great deal of apprehension and with a great deal of questions.

We feel that national categories—the trend now is away from national categories—but as you outline in this comprehensive youth bill, to outline certain criteria is good. We feel that is very good and we highly support this because it would set up the guidelines so this group would not be examined out on the local level.

We support also the point of a comprehensive youth plan, of merging the different or bringing together the different youth programs under one authority, one administration.

We do not object to having the cities as the sponsors just so long as we have guidelines so that we will make sure the groups that need to be served will be served.

And we support the recreation part. The other parts in my presentation are submitted for the record, but these are the points I wanted to highlight and bring to the committee's attention.

Mr. HAWKINS. Your statement in its entirety will be entered in the record at this point.

[Statement referred to follows:]

TESTIMONY BY JAMES M. CHAVIS, DIRECTOR OF THE BALTIMORE NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS

My name is James M. Chavis. I am Director of Baltimore City Neighborhood Youth Corps and Vice President of National Association of Neighborhood Youth Corps Directors.

Mr. Chairman, let me first express my appreciation for the opportunity to bring the views of the staff and enrollees of the Baltimore City Neighborhood Youth Corps Program and those of the Baltimore City Community Action Agency. We consider this invitation a distinct honor and hope the testimony presented today will be helpful to this committee as it considers what may well be a major landmark in domestic legislation.

My testimony today will be in two parts. The first will deal with an evaluation of the manpower needs of young people today and the programs currently attempting to meet these needs. The second part will deal with our current and proposed manpower legislation as it relates to young people and directions we feel that the programs could possibly move toward.

The youth employment problem today approaches that of a major disaster. Unemployment throughout the nation is high for all ages and for all races; however, in no group is the percentage and depth of unemployment as high as it is for the young. When we consider the problems of the young minorities, the unemployment problem approaches a level doubled that we experienced during a national depression. Minority youth today are in and have been in a depression for some time and things do not appear to be improving, in fact, they appear to be getting worse.

The problems of unemployment of all races continues today as perhaps the major domestic unmet need.

The City of Baltimore is the 7th largest city in the nation and the nation's number one inland seaport. There are approximately 25,000 young people between the age of 16 and 21 who are high school dropouts and more than 50%, approximately 12,500, are unemployed. These figures do not include the high school graduates who are also unemployed. The statistics kept by the local Department of Employment Security are not always totally accurate in showing the full unemployment problem in a particular region because many people are never counted in their statistics, they never register for work, and do not consider the employment service as a real resource in their search for a job.

The unemployment problem for youth is magnified during the summer when the 10's of thousands of high school students begin the annual search for some productive summer activity. In Baltimore there are approximately 80,000 senior and junior high school students, most of whom will be looking for some employment activity during summer and most of whom will be unsuccessful in their search. The major sources of summer employment for youth are the Neighborhood Youth Corps which provides the overwhelming majority of the summer jobs for low income youth and the NABS Jobs Program. We have been told in Baltimore that there will be a considerable reduction in the number of employment opportunities offered by the NABS Jobs Program because of the current employment situation. In the past years the Neighborhood Yough Corps in Baltimore has operated at a summer level of approximately 7,000 which is only about 7.5% of the number of junior and senior high school students in the area.

There are only two programs in Baltimore which specialize in the youth employment problem, the Neighborhood Youth Corps and the Job Corps. The Job Corps because of its nature can handle only small numbers and these have to be handled in locations that sometimes remove the youngster from his home. The Skill Centers that are being developed in certain locations around the country provide a wonderful addition to the current Job Corps concept and we support and encourage the production of the Job Corps Skill Centers.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps is by far the major program attempting to meet the employment needs of the youths. The Out of School Neighborhood Youth Corps Program in all areas, Baltimore included, is funded at a slot level too small and too restricted to meet the needs that a probram potential could meet. The basic concept and operational methods of the Neighborhood Youth Corps Out of School Program, we feel, are good. However, it needs to be expanded greatly and the local sponsors given more flexibility and control over programming and use of resources. We strongly encourage this distinguished committee to consider this.

An evaluation of current poverty programs, whether in manpower or in other areas, is difficult and has to be approached very carefully. Most of the current evaluations of the manpower programs, we feel, are not valid or conclusive as they usually begin with a negative approach by individuals whose basic aim is to discredit or take control of the program from their current sponsors. The efforts of most of the critics and so called evaluators of our current manpower programs is geared at taking control or eliminating and not improving the programs and this cannot be over emphasized.

There is one point that we wish to give some special attention, the current revenue sharing proposals and the elimination of categorical manpower programs is an area that gives us great concern. We feel that there is a need for specific categories in manpower legislation on a national level, as there are specific needs in the manpower field that are national in scope. Abolition of categories would not serve the needs of the young people. It would be to the detriment of the localities and could possibly destroy the entire manpower effort for many years to come. Young people have different needs in their search for jobs from those of older people, and the young high school drop outs have some very definite needs. There is a need for programs such as Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps, and others of this nature to work with these specific needs. We recognize the need for more flexibility on the local level but this flexibility must be carried out according to federal guidelines. Some local politicians given complete control of spending the manpower resources would perpetuate their own existance and own power first, and secondly, use these funds to meet the needs of the people. The poor, the disadvantaged, the black, the Chicanos and others will receive very little service in most areas if they are not instrumental in maintaining the current power structure in a particular locality. The services given them in many areas now reflect this.

We do feel the need for some centralized administration and control of manpower programs and the efforts currently being made with the Comprehensive Area Manpower Planning Systems (CAMPS) we feel is a positive effort and we encourage its continuation.

All manpower programs geared to serve the poor and the young must have an in put from these groups in its planning and operation. They must also be made to be administratively and programatically responsive and to some degree responsible to them. This can only be done through national categorical programs and will probably not be done through the administrations concept of Revenue

Sharing. Revenue Sharing is to many people states rights through the back door and those who are black or members of a minority race know that in any situation comparable to states rights they are in serious trouble and we can see this as being no different. The federal government must insure adequate and fair treatment of all groups and not leave groups to the discretion of local political machines and parties.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, we feel that the Sub Committee on Economic Opportunity is to be commended for considering the employment problems of youth as it is a major national problem, and if solutions are not found, could become a national catastrophe. We feel there is a need for more resources and a greater national commitment to deal with this problem; however, we must caution against some of the proposals currently being made as they would be a step backwards. There is a need for a national category and we feel that this could be coupled with greater control in flexibility given to the local sponsors in the operation of programs. The employment problems of the young people today are really the employment problems of this country and we support the efforts of this distinguished committee to bring some relief to the hundreds of thousands of young people who need help.

I support the "Comprehensive Youth Opportunity Act of 1973". The combining of the N.Y.C. Programs, making them year round and adding again the cultural and recreational components would strengthen the program. Making the age range 16 to 21 would also give the programs a definable and workable age group to serve. We hope your efforts will succeed.

Mr. Chairman, let me thank you again for the distinct privilege of appearing before your distinguished committee and having the opportunity to present our views on this important piece of legislation.

Thank you.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Morris, I think you wanted to summarize.

Mr. MORRIS. I would like to state the position of the National Association.

We are in agreement with what you are proposing here today. We feel that there has been a need for a long time for someone to recognize the frustration of the many directors in trying to implement a summer program when funds are received in June.

We would also like to commend you on recognizing the culture enrichment areas of manpower programs. This has been labeled many times by the Department of Labor as a do-nothing-type project.

When one looks at the total youth programs, the TV "Sesame Street" programs, the exploration—these are worthwhile projects which should be retained in NYC.

I think that your bill today will offer a light to many many directors across the country. And I would like to thank you for inviting us to appear today.

Mr. HAWKINS. I want to thank both of you. I would hope that we can work out something to include this bill in a comprehensive manpower bill as I have previously suggested.

I am rather optimistic that we can make some headway. The only thing that I regret is that it will not be operative this summer. And that is why we have emphasized some of the questions concerning the summer program, because we do have a double job of doing something this summer and then planning a long range program.

Thank you again for your presentation.

That concludes the hearing of the Subcommittee on Equal Opportunities this morning.

The meeting is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 12:10 p.m., the subcommittee adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.]

○